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

Document part: A36 - Hotel, Guildford Road, East Horsley
**Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/87</th>
<th>Respondent: 8555041 / Adrian Platt</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brownfield Development**, where I understand that you feel that you have used up all GBC brownfield sites. Whilst I know that you are required to consult with neighbouring Boroughs, I would like to be categorically assured that GBC have examined with Waverley and other Boroughs the possibility of using their brownfield sites before encroaching on our Borough’s green belt.

**Sites A36 and A41.** I am in favour of the elimination of these potential sites in the plan.

I look forward to hearing from you again as the consultation progresses.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8274</th>
<th>Respondent: 8566497 / Derek Horne &amp; Associates Ltd (Derek Horne)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A36, RAMADA HOTEL**

This Green Belt site is located outside the Defined Settlement Boundary of East Horsley and proposes a density of development that is out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. As a gateway site to the village along the A246, the proposals would be harmful to the character of the area. Moreover, vehicular access is not ideal given its proximity to two sharp bends on the A246.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4295</th>
<th>Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site A36 Hotel,Guildford Road, East Horsley**

170. I object to this site being included.

171. This site is an example of extension of the settlement boundary, along with insetting, to encourage building on the greenfield part of the site as well as the existing built area and car park.
172. I do not accept the proposed change to the settlement boundary and any future development should be restricted to the brownfield part of the site.

173. The hotel is a valuable component of the local tourist industry and non-viability has not been proved and the main Chown-built building at the front of the site is a local icon and part of the local heritage.

174. A change of use to housing would lead to increased traffic movements from the site on to the busy A246 at peak times. In particular, this would involve commuters attempting to turn right to travel to Guildford, Horsley Station, local schools, the A3 and the M25. These right turns across a busy road are in close proximity to other junctions, a petrol station and bends in the road.

175. If non-viability of the existing hotel use is proved satisfactorily then an alternative use, that does not generate commuter traffic, should be a care home, or smaller homes for retired people (freeing up larger homes elsewhere for families), could be sensible alternative options. The existing green space would provide a useful open space area for these alternative developments.

176. The recent planning application for this site identified the need for a pedestrian crossing on the A246 on sustainability grounds - so that residents could have safe access to the infrequent bus service. However, past discussions have suggested that a crossing is not viable at this location for a number of reasons given by SCC appear to be suggesting that a pedestrian island refuge will be sufficient but I am not convinced that there is room for this or that it will be safe.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3485  **Respondent:** 8573793 / Harry Eve  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the removal of the proposal for this site.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/889  **Respondent:** 8659489 / Helen Bennett  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( Yes ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Ramada Hotel does not provide a local amenity of much value. It is a suitable site for redevelopment, as long as it keeps within the current building footprint and does not extend into any open areas of grassland which surround it. Horsley has a need for smaller dwellings, especially for downsizing. A courtyard development, perhaps with some flats, combed with starter homes and flats would for younger people starting out would provide a lively new community base in East Horsley.

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

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7716  Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

- I object to the allocation of Thatchers’ Hotel, EH – allocation A36

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3388  Respondent: 8746465 / Matthew Tipper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

We object to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

1. The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.
2. Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.
3. The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.
4. No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.
5. The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.
6. The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.
7. The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.
8. Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.
9. Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2176  Respondent: 8774113 / Ian Elliott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

Overall comment – the local plan has adopted a ‘lazy’ policy of developing green belt at the expense of sourcing and maximising brownfield sites in urban areas.

Specific comment – Horsley area - the removal of the A36 ‘Thatchers’ hotel site makes no planning sense and causes an adverse knock-on effect to other local areas. As a previously developed ‘brownfield’ site this is a perfect location to add housing at little detriment. It is unclear why this site has been removed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/100  Respondent: 8792193 / Brian Wolfe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

5  Site Allocation Policies

5.1. There are 5 East Horsley sites identified in the LAA, two of which are allocated under Local Plan policies, whilst the adjacent parish of West Horsley has 6 sites identified in the LAA, four of which are allocated in the Local Plan. I would comments on these site policies are as follows:

5.2. Policy A36 Hotel, Guildford Road proposes to re-develop the current Thacher’s Hotel for housing. Whilst I do not object to housing development on this landmark site located at the entrance of the village, it is absolutely essential that it is developed in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent location. The site is close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting. There is some concern over the loss of employment of which there is very little in the village and the also the loss of the hotel as a base for tourists. My principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. (Original SHLA said 32) At 48 units it gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this site. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare and that included some semi-detached homes. Less than 30 units would be more appropriate for this location

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5235  Respondent: 8792193 / Brian Wolfe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

Policy Site 36 Land Former Thatchers Hotel East Horsley site no longer in Local Plan

I support the removal of this site for housing development.
• It could if re developed with housing [as pointed by the inspector] result in the over development of a key edge of village site.
• There is a case for retaining the current use as a Hotel.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/709  Respondent: 8795553 / Robert Taylor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Policy A36: Hotel, Guildford Road: I OBJECT to this policy. The housing numbers proposed in this policy are far too high for this prominent landmark location, resulting in a housing density that is out of keeping with this area and the village of East Horsley in general.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2011  Respondent: 8804417 / Vivian and Philip Markley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

1. Thatchers Hotel - proposed replacement by 48 dwellings

This is unacceptable. GBC themselves have already rejected the planning proposal previously submitted by the owners of Thatchers. I live directly behind Thatchers, and proposed development would adversely affect my wellbeing, and my right to peaceful enjoyment of my life (under the provisions of the Human Rights Act) by virtue of increased noise and light pollution. In addition public safety would be compromised and adversely affected - the entrance/exit to Thatchers is already a safety hazard, opening as it does on to the busy A246 on a bend; the additional and more frequent traffic from 48 houses would make it positively dangerous.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4611  Respondent: 8817153 / Paul Ives  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

We applaud the decision to omit this policy from the Draft Local Plan. This policy would have increased traffic access risk on a dangerous bend of the A246.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2704  Respondent: 8819329 / Lindsey Haines  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I therefore object to the following policies:

Policy A36 - Hotel, Guildford Road, which is proposing a housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare. An added factor to object to is the loss of a local amenity.


This land is within the Green Belt and I object to this proposal

Policies A37, A38, A40 and A41-Land in West Horsley. All areas within the Green Belt and which would represent an increase in housing of 36%. This would lead to the destruction of the village character and have enormous impact on the infrastructure of both East and West Horsley. I therefore object to these policies.

Policy A35 - Land at former Wisley Airfield. This proposes a new town in the heart of the Surrey Green Belt. It would have a major impact on the local villages and roads and would contravene Metropolitan Green Belt policy. I therefore object to it.

I have only commented specifically on policies that affect East and West Horsley as these are the villages that I know. I am sure that people in other villages will be making their thoughts known about their particular areas. However, I reiterate that I object to the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the whole of the Guildford Borough because I consider the reasoning behind the need for 25% increase in housing to be flawed. I also consider that the Council has not taken the wishes of its electorate into consideration.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/379  Respondent: 8820929 / A J Stuart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I object to the potential six main development sites contained in the Draft local Plan which are located in and around the Horsleys:
Thatchers Hotel (Ref. A36 ID2044) is a very busy area of the village, the traffic is heavy and this hotel defines the edge of the village with a local landmark- to allow the construction of up to 48 houses on this site would be totally wrong, in my view.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2021  **Respondent:** 8821025 / Karen McQuaid  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Site A36 - I OBJECT to the proposed development of this site without serious consideration being given to the fact that it is on a dangerous bend on the A246 with the junction of Ockham Road South and sited next door to a petrol station.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3046  **Respondent:** 8821377 / Marion Garrett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I object to the Thatcher Hotel site A36

1) Access dangerous.

2) Better marketing could improve the Hotel and tourism in Guildford.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/131  **Respondent:** 8823553 / Rick Day  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

In principle this seems an ideal site but there are 3 considerations: as one drives through East Horsley on the A246 there appear to be few dwellings (because most are tucked away from the main thoroughfares) and so a large development on this corner plot could destroy that illusion and alter the observable nature of the village; Horsley Towers is immediately in the background of this plot so that any development ought to be low rise; the replacement of hotel accommodation with housing would appear to be at odds with Policy E6 to preserve visitor accommodation. Therefore where are the lost rooms to be located?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5429  Respondent: 8824833 / Stephen Stuart-Matthews  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

I fully support the removal of new housing planned on site A36 Ramada Thatchers Hotel from the draft Local Plan 2017. Increasing numbers of visitors to Guildford Borough will need the hotel space. This hotel provides accommodation with relatively easy access to RHS Wisley the largest growing visitor attraction in the Borough. It also provides welcome employment for young people in the Borough.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2061  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Site A36: Thatcher’s Hotel, East Horsley (48 houses)

Of the 6 sites (36-41), this is the least impactful as it only proposes the addition of 48 new houses. However, the main issue regarding this proposal is one of road access and safety because, as will be known, Thatcher’s Hotel sits between two very sharp bends and includes an already very busy junction, particularly in the mornings due to (in particular) people going to work and primary school traffic. Additionally, the nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either.

Equally, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by which has no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built which will bring an additional 120 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8251  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to policy A36 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1458  **Respondent:** 8850433 / Ian Doherty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher's Hotel for housing.

My principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

*I would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density more in keeping with the character of the village.*

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6783  **Respondent:** 8856961 / Ronessa Hunt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Proposed development of Thatchers Hotel.

There is just no confidence in the Authorities locally at their ability or willingness to respect the mood of dwellings in the villages.

Time and again approval is granted for developments that have met with huge groundswell of local opposition.

The rights of the individual are ignored.

The initial plans shown on this development show complete disregard for the local mood, image, trends.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4146  **Respondent:** 8858657 / Oliver Cass  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Proposed development of Thatchers Hotel.

There is just no confidence in the Authorities locally at their ability or willingness to respect the mood of dwellings in the villages.

Time and again approval is granted for developments that have met with huge groundswell of local opposition.

The rights of the individual are ignored.

The initial plans shown on this development show complete disregard for the local mood, image, trends.

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

Attached documents:
I am comfortable that the loss of the hotel would not significantly adversely impact East Horsley. I am also of the view that given this is already a developed site (e, brownfield) it represents the type of site the Council should be looking to develop rather than seeking out entirely greenfield sites.

Developing the site would also give the opportunity to upgrade that part of the A246, perhaps putting in roundabouts at the junctions with Ockham Road South and Chalk Lane, to reduce speeds and dangerous turns.

If there is to be development then I would not object to development at this site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6954  Respondent: 8858913 / Stephen Carter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

A36 - Thatcher’s Hotel, East Horsley

This is a long-standing East Horsley village hotel (I well remember visiting it as a child in the 60's for the afternoon tea which it was well known for). As well as being a significant employer it has provided valuable and scarce rural accommodation for visiting tourists, but, if it is now not economically viable, then I would support a housing development at this site if it was kept in character with its position and relative to the rest of East Horsley.

The current 48 dwellings proposed works out at 37 per hectare which considerably exceeds the highest density of 13 per hectare found in any of the roads around East Horsley. Therefore could not support this site in the Local Plan unless the number of dwellings was reduced to produce a considerably lower housing density.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2666  Respondent: 8877121 / Tim Sindall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

Other reasons notwithstanding, I endorse the proposal to remove site A36 from the former Local Plan insofar as it addresses completely concerns voiced previously over the safety of vehicles and their occupants intending to leave this site onto the busy A246 Guildford to Leatherhead road due to inadequate sight lines coupled with two adjacent road junctions.

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

None

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6707</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887009 / Jacqueline Weller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A36 which proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing, being concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887265 / Harvey Weller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A36 which proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing, being concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4424</th>
<th>Respondent: 8888961 / Susan Fortune</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would also seem to me a mistake to demolish Thatchers which will presumably be necessary to accommodate so many new houses. The property was designed by Frank Chown who, along with the Earl of Lovelace, gave East Horsley its architectural heritage and so it should be preserved. There are also now very few hotels in an area that currently attracts tourists due to its wide range of cultural and leisure attractions and I am sure Thatchers could maximise its capabilities as a business in the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 6 sites (36-41), this is the least impactful as it only proposes the addition of 48 new houses. However, the main issue regarding this proposal is one of road access and safety because, as will be known, Thatcher's Hotel sits between two very sharp bends and includes an already very busy junction, particularly in the mornings due to (in particular) people going to work and primary school traffic. Additionally, the nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either.

Equally, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by which has no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built which will bring an additional 120 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold **SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS** against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7448  **Respondent:** 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

**Site A36: Thatcher’s Hotel, East Horsley (48 houses)**

Of the 6 sites (36-41), this is the least impactful as it only proposes the addition of 48 new houses. However, the main issue regarding this proposal is one of road access and safety because, as will be known, Thatcher’s Hotel sits between two very sharp bends and includes an already very busy junction, particularly in the mornings due to (in particular) people going to work and primary school traffic. Additionally, the nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either.

Equally, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by which has no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built which will bring an additional 120 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold **SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS** against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8244  **Respondent:** 8896161 / Carol Wilson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

[A36] I object to the use of the Thatchers Hotel site for housing. There are too few hotels already and the Thatchers Hotel is close to the new Opera house at Horsley Place.

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

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: pslp172/4061  Respondent: 8900481 / John Burgess  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

I APPROVE the removal of sites A36 and A41 but these do not go far enough.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3501  Respondent: 8901441 / Michael J. Apse  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I wish to object to Thatchers Hotel being included in the new Local Plan for development of 48 houses.

This proposal creates a density of 12 houses per acre whilst the local density in this area is 4 houses per acre. This would be a considerable over development of the site. It would create a detrimental visual appearance on the eastern entrance to the village against the parkland setting of adjacent Horsley Towers.

The proposed use of the existing access onto Guildford Road will create a hazardous situation with up to 100 cars leaving and entering the site onto the very busy A246 especially at peak times. The location of the access set between 2 dangerous S bends ,3 other roads ,a busy petrol station ,a pub with car park, some cottages is totally unsuitable and dangerous.

I consider this hotel is a good local amenity providing a number of facilities for local residents to this site including a bar, restaurant, meeting and conference rooms ,weddings and accommodation for visitors. This would all be lost including local employment at a time when more housing for Horsley is under consideration.

There is very limited public transport available to this site whilst the train station is a 25-30 min walk and with car spaces generally fully occupied during weekdays.

There are no local job opportunities available for new residents.

A major part of this site 'is in a Green Belt area and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify a development. A planning application for development of this site with a similar number of houses was recently refused by Guildford BC with good sound reasons.

There is therefore no requirement for this site to be included in the new Local Plan and it should be delated.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3976  Respondent: 8906881 / G Hartigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Building 48 houses at Thatchers Hotel is a particular concern for me as my garden wall runs along one boundary. This wall was built in about 1970 when Thatchers decided to build a swimming pool. They built up the land on their side and built a very unstable wall which is very high on my side. After the first rain this wall started moving so cement had to be put along it to stabilise it. Any excavating and building near the wall could be very dangerous and cause the wall to collapse.

Also the amount of cars coming on to an already very dangerous bend of the A246 where there is Chalk Lane, the Shell Garage, the turning to the village, entrance to Guildford Lodge Drive, and the Duke pub would be horrendous.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8042  Respondent: 8907809 / Sarah White  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The Thatchers Hotel proposal would both take away an important local amenity while providing an out-of-character estate on the edge of the village. The A246/Ockham Road junction is already subject to regular rush-hour gridlock and the increased traffic would only make this worse. There is also the safety issue of further traffic entering the A246 at an already busy location.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8051  Respondent: 8913889 / Penny White  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thatchers, on the A246, also has had planning rejected unanimously as it is a local amenity which provides tourism, jobs and is a centre for various local celebrations. Both of these should be taken out of the plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7361  Respondent: 8915905 / Rhiannon Stroud  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support Policy A36 (Thatcher’s Hotel, East Horsley)

As a site that has already been developed, I support the use of this land to provide for local housing need.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1580  Respondent: 8919521 / Susan Hughes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

SITES

POLICY A36: Hotel Guildford Road. OBJECT. For all of the reasons previously outlined - the current infrastructure cannot take a further 48 new homes. Medical Centre and local Primary School are already at capacity. Roads are unfit for current usage, let alone increased usage. The owners of the new homes will need to travel to work (as work options are very few in the Village) so road and rail usage will increase. The plan also shows no consideration for the Green Belt nor the preservation of one of Horsley’s finest landmarks. It will also lead to loss of employment.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7669  Respondent: 8928961 / Sue Reeve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Site A36 Thatchers Hotel

I have no objection in principle to development on this brownfield site but I think there should be very strict design rules for the area as Thatchers sits just outside the edge of the East Horsley conservation area next door to the historic Grade II* listed Horsley Towers and the hotel which was built by renowned local architect, Frank Chown (who built many of the lovely houses in East Horsley) reflects the ambience and openness of the area. This is the only brownfield site available for development in the village, although recently a planning application on this site was rejected because a need for a local hotel was considered paramount. The application, of course included large houses (good profit margins) when in fact the village needs smaller dwellings.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/72  Respondent: 8929057 / East Horsley Parish Council (Nick Clemens)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

1. SITES POLICIES
Of the many sites policies set out in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, we comment upon those in East Horsley as well as several in the surrounding area which may affect the village.

Five East Horsley sites are identified in GBC’s Land Availability Assessment (‘LAA’), two of which are allocated under policies in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The adjacent parish of West Horsley has six sites identified in the LAA, four of which are allocated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Our comments on these site policies are as follows:

**POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road**

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

EHPC is concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. However, assuming that the employment loss can be justified, (which is a condition of Policy A36), then EHPC is broadly supportive of housing development at this location, providing it is done in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent landmark position at the entrance to the village. The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting.

Whilst we endorse many of the requirements set out in Policy A36, our principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

EHPC would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2500  **Respondent:** 8938881 / Ann Cook  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

**SITES POLICIES**

Policy A36 Thatchers Hotel

An application for this development was very wisely refused by GBC earlier in the year on many grounds. I do not see the logic therefore for including this site in the Local Plan. Also now that the new opera house has received planning permission there is likely to be even more demand for hotel rooms in the village.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7787  **Respondent:** 8944929 / A Jefferies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the allocation of Thatchers' Hotel, EH – allocation

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4318</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Site A36 - Hotel, Guildford Road, East Horsley

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal. The recent planning application for change of use and development of 49 dwellings on this land was, quite rightly, rejected so there can be no justification for including the whole site in the local plan as a development site for housing. Any redevelopment of this site should be restricted to the brownfield part.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated, and no justification for its change of use.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7214</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal. The recent planning application for change of use and development of 49 dwellings on this land was, quite rightly, rejected so there can be no justification for including the whole site in the local plan as a development site for housing. Any redevelopment of this site should be restricted to the brownfield part.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated, and no justification for its change of use.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4232</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Site A36 - Hotel, Guildford Road, East Horsley

I SUPPORT the removal of this site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1277  Respondent: 8958369 / B.P. Austin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

East and West Horsley Sites : A36 to A41

I object to these sites which encroach on the Green Belt.

1. I object to the policy Site A36 (Hotel). Although safeguards are proposed for the historic setting the housing density is well above surrounding area (37 dwellings per hectare compared to 8.1) and will be out of keeping. The access to the site will be tricky because of the busy A246 road and special arrangements will be needed for traffic. A very significant reduction in the housing density would be needed to make this site acceptable.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4141  Respondent: 9050337 / Nigel Geary  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

I am concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. However, assuming that the employment loss can be justified, (which is a condition of Policy A36), then I am broadly supportive of housing development at this location, providing it is done in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent landmark position at the entrance to the village. The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting.

Whilst we endorse many of the requirements set out in Policy A36, our principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

I would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: psp172/3713  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

I object to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.

The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.

The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7843  Respondent: 9228769 / Cathryn Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Attached documents:
Thatchers Hotel ReDevelopment

Two issues here. There is no other local hotel accommodation unless you go further south to Guildford or to Leatherhead/Cobham as the adjoining DeVere is NOT open to the general public. With the approval of the Opera House at West Horsley Place, removing our one hotel accommodation seems a remarkably stupid move, loosing local jobs and business. Plus the hotel is very full many nights. Secondly I live opposite the hotel and can attest that the A246 is a very busy road coming into the turn at that corner. With an additional 100 odd cars going in and out at the junction without the imposition of a roundabout or traffic lights, there will be huge accidents and no matter what increase congestion for which there has been no plan. Plus as the first planning application showed, such a development will negatively impact on Horsley Towers.

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

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

I support the removal of this Allocation from the draft Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6912  Respondent: 10326081 / Ian Wilkinson  Agent:

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of these sites.

This constitutes serious level of over-development of these villages, particularly Wet Horsely which has retained its open connection with the green belt.

The construction of 533 new houses on these 6 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is (a) excessive in absolute terms and (b) disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough; it would destroy the rural character of these communities.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2187  Respondent: 10580385 / Brenda Aldred  Agent:

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

7. SITES POLICIES

A36 Thatchers Hotel

Comment: It is appreciated that this site lends itself to housing, but the Plan for 48 houses and apartments is a density of 37 dwellings per hectare which I consider far too high as the average housing density in East Horsley is 8.1 dwellings per hectare.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2779  Respondent: 10817121 / Roger Adams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road

The subject of this policy, The Thatcher’s Hotel, is an iconic landmark; a long-standing Tudor style village hotel set at the eastern entrance to East Horsley village.

Policy D3: Historic Environment of the draft plan states that

“Guildford borough’s historic environment is intrinsically part of what makes Guildford the place it is, that it acknowledges the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation can bring to our community and that it will conserve and enhance the historic environment in a manner appropriate to its significance.”

It further states that:

“Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and works which would cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, or its setting, will not be permitted without a clear justification to show that the public benefits of the proposal considerably outweigh any harm to the significance or special interest of the heritage asset in question.”

I OBJECT to this policy as I believe that The Thatcher Hotel is part of this historic environment and that this policy runs contrary to Policy D3.

Furthermore Policy E6: The leisure and visitor experience. States:

“The loss of existing visitor, leisure and cultural attractions, including arts and entertainment facilities, hotels and indoor sports venues, will be strongly resisted unless replacement facilities of an equivalent or better standard and provision are proposed in a location equally accessible to the facility’s current catchment area.”

I believe that The Thatcher Hotel is such an existing visitor attraction. Not only does it cater for visitors by providing accommodation and restaurant facilities but attracts visitors by virtue of providing rooms for receptions, parties and so forth.

Therefore I OBJECT to this policy as it runs contrary to Policy E6

My final concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48. This number gives a gross housing density of 37 dph. The average dph in East Horsley is 8.1 dph. According to the local parish council the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

The proposed dph is therefore approximately 9 times the average in the village, which makes it exceptionally high for this location.

Thus, I OBJECT to Policy A36 on the grounds that it is out of keeping with local character, context and distinctiveness, and therefore breaches the NPPF and emerging GBC Policy H1.

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

Attached documents:
22.2 The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

22.3 Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

22.4 The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

22.5 No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.

22.6 The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.

22.7 The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

22.8 The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

22.9 Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

22.10 Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5761   Respondent: 10858753 / Carole Warren   Agent:   
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I strongly object to the development of Thatcher's Hotel, Horsley

This would result in loss of a Hotel Site, impacting local businesses.

The proximity to Grade II listed Horsley Towers
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3830    Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter    Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

1 POLICIES A36 to A41

1.1 I object to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

1.2 The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

1.3 Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.

1.4 The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley, which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.

1.5 No attempt is made to assess the cumulative impact on the Horsleys – either of the four sites now proposed, or of Site A35 (Three Farms Meadow, alias “Wisley Airfield”), with over 2,000 new homes only 2 miles away. This piecemeal approach leaves the future of the Horsleys at the mercy of ad hoc planning applications, which is the opposite of what a Local Plan should intend.

1.6 The new plan Policies put greater emphasis on the need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to underpin development. But this is not reflected in any new wording on the Horsley sites, thus leaving most local objections unaddressed. Again, this defect curtails the plan’s usefulness as a practical planning tool at a site level and undermines its credibility among residents.

1.7 The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage, flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.

1.8 The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites too is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality at present.

1.9 Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan presents no arguments for this which, contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

1.10 Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been an outstanding success story in the Horsleys, as detailed in response to the last consultation. Assets include a dense public footpath network, parish parks, sports fields, a campsite of international standard, Britain’s newest rural opera theatre and the popular Olympic cycle route. These examples of positive planning depend on a Local Plan that protects the Green Belt, maintains its openness and beauty and avoids urbanisation and traffic congestion. Sites A35-41 are hostile to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1) Thatchers Hotel and Horsley Towers:

> I am disappointed to see this development proposal. There are very limited places to walk for Drinks and Casual Meals and this will remove a necessary scenic retreat leaving only one Pub.

> Heavy Rain last year demonstrated drainage and flooding problems along roads slanting down into the Village. Further remedial action is needed before exacerbating the problem with this elevated site development.

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

2) Development of plots near St Martin's Close, East Horsley; and Thatcher's Hotel

The proposal to build houses on these brownfield sites offers a good opportunity for development. However, the plan does not make clear the plans for infrastructure and amenities that increased housing presents.

1. **Parking and traffic**

It is proposed that two sites near St Martin's Close will each contain 15 houses and the third 10 houses. The document gives no information as to the size of proposed houses to be built on the site but from the density of the proposed houses it would appear that they are to be terraced. The 10 current houses and 4 maisonettes on St Martin's Close are also terrace/semi detached and do not have driveways. Therefore all traffic from the current houses and maisonettes park on the road. Basing this on an average of at least 1.5 cars per household for the borough of Guildford and accounting for the fact that each house has a garage this still means that there are upwards of 7 cars parked on the road already. There is a small car park behind the houses but this is predominantly used by people working in the parade of shops at Bishopsmead and the postmen/post vans. People parking on St Martin's Close include visitors to the sheltered housing, members of bowling club, staff and visitors to Limegrove Residential Home, and users of the St Martin's church. This means that demand for parking is high and often all available parking is taken. If the new houses are not to include sufficient parking further demand will be put on St Martin's Close and its current residents. The plan also does not make clear where the access road to the new houses would be located. St Martin's Close, with cars parked, becomes a single laned road along which cars pass in both directions. Increased traffic flow to the new houses would make passage along this road more difficult. Is it proposed that access to the new houses would be from the main road? If access to the new development is from the existing roads in the Close, or the access road to the garages, I would object most strongly to the proposed development.
The proposed development of Thatcher's hotel will also increase the number of cars using the A246 and roads though the village. The junction onto the A246 from the village is already highly congested at peak times, with traffic waiting considerable amounts of time to join the A246/turn into Ockham Road South. If such a development does take place how will this junction be improved?

1. **Drainage**

Is the current drainage system able to accommodate waste water from an additional houses? Also, will there be a reduction of land into which rainwater can drain? The current Local Plan does not include flood information from the previous few years where the village was adversely affected by the amount of rain that we had. This meant that access out of the village became difficult as the access road to the A3 was flooded from about Christmas until March/April. This meant that East Horsley encountered increased traffic using the A246 to exit the Horsleys.

**3. Schooling**

Increased housing will mean increased numbers of children. The local school, The Raleigh, is the only state school in the Horsleys, is already over-subscribed and does not have the space to expand further. New classrooms had to be added in 2012/2013 to accommodate the current children being educated. Northcote and Nightingale Crescents, on which the school is located, are small village roads meaning that parking is very problematic with daily traffic jams and difficulty for local residents trying to leave or return to their houses. Traffic starts arriving at the school from 7.30am for the breakfast club and continues until past 6pm for the after school club.

Children from the Raleigh school then attend the Howard of Effingham Secondary School. This school is also over-subscribed and historically (in 2007) pupils from the Raleigh School were sent to other secondary schools in the Surrey area, many much further away and taking hours to access by public transport (Therfield at Leatherhead, the 5th nearest SCC secondary school to East being 11.8km away; ranked 51 out of 86 in Surrey for GCSE passes; Bishop David Brown at Sheerwater, the 9th nearest school at a distance of 12.5km; ranked 83 out of 86 in Surrey for GCSE passes; and Christ's College and Guildford, the 13th nearest school at a distance of 13/8km; ranked 84 out of 86 in Surrey for GCSE passes). Although this led to children at the Raleigh being assured of a place at the Howard of Effingham Secondary School further increasing the demand for places from Horsley children may mean that such a scenario happens again.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7439  **Respondent:** 10915681 / Karen Bushnell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

3) My next objection is in particular to the proposed development of 48 houses on the Thatcher's site. Ref A36. This is adjacent to a conservation area and an area of historic interest. The new development would totally change the character of this area and obscure the views of Horsley Towers and obliterate the surrounding countryside on the edge of an AONB. This disregards your policy point under Environment 2. " To protect these areas of conservation.....". The A246 is already busy in this area with regular tail backs in each direction and difficulty finding a break in the traffic to pull out.

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

**Attached documents:**
POLICY A36: Hotel Guildford Road. OBJECT. The current infrastructure cannot take a further 48 new homes.

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

Attached documents:

9. Proposed development of Thatcher's Hotel (A36)

I object to this proposal.

Thatcher's Hotel is a longstanding amenity of East Horsley. Increased patronage appears likely when the new West Horsley Place opera commences. While the NPPF (para 89) allows for redevelopment of previously developed sites within the Green Belt, the redevelopment must not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

Erecting 48 houses on the site implies a density, and spatial orientation, clearly at odds with this criterion. Reasonable alternatives, such as converting the existing buildings into flats (like the sympathetic conversion of Maranello House on the main shopping parade), and without increasing the scale or existing footprint of the hotel, do not appear to have been considered.

Access to and from the A246 at the present entrance to the hotel would likely be insufficient, and any enlarged or new entrance onto the A246 would increase traffic, and worsen an existing hazard in the vicinity of a sharp bend, which has been the scene of multiple accidents over the years.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to these policies Utterly disproportionate! The impact of clustering of such huge numbers of dwellings in a low density Village area is tantamount to vandalism. A thinner spread, based on demonstrable figures, across the whole borough might have lesser impact does not seem to have been considered. This part of the borough appears to have been selected for a disproportionate burden.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2254  Respondent: 11009281 / David Foot  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

On a more positive note I applaud the Council's proposal to remove site A36 as a potential building site. Plainly the existing hotel on this site is potentially viable - particularly with the arrival of the Grange Park opera - and the advantages of retaining it comprehensively outweigh the very arguable merits of building houses.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1709  Respondent: 11012097 / John & Jean Waters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I object to the plan to build on the site of Thatchers Hotel. The A246 main road at this point is already severely congested, especially where the road bends round sharply with fast-moving traffic. A hundred or so extra cars joining the road here in order to access the station, schools, shops and the A3 will cause much added congestion and the risk of serious accidents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6084  Respondent: 11013153 / Peter Carter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

Loss of agricultural land

1. The proposals, in particular in relation to Blackwell Farms would remove a large proportion of the working agricultural land that is proximate to Guildford. This is important both for the food it produces but also for its importance in providing an educational gateway for children living in the town to ensure they understand how their food is produced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Having read the revisions to the local plan I am writing to strongly object to the local plan as it currently stands. Whilst I recognise that there are improvements such as stopping the development of the Thatcher’s site, I am fundamentally opposed to any development of the green belt in the borough of Guildford or any proposal to inset East Horsley from the green belt.

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

Policy A36-A41 East and West Horsley
I object to the changes to Policies A36-A41 (East and West Horsley). The potential development sites have been reduced by two (A36 and A41) representing 138 dwellings. This leaves 4 sites which still represent 395 new dwellings. I object to all of these 4 sites remaining for the following reasons:

- they collectively represent in absolute terms, overdevelopment in East and West Horsley and in relation to the rest of the borough this is disproportionate. The many objections from residents have not been heeded, and the imbalance has not been corrected.

- no “exceptional circumstances” or any justification has been given in the plan for this unaccountable imbalance where 70% of all new development in the borough is to be on Green Belt sites

- the sites situated on the edge of the existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and would require the extension of settlement boundaries. The plan does not give reasons or justification for this and the effect of development of new buildings here would be contrary to NPPF para 79 because it will contribute to urban sprawl by lessening and reducing the value of the Green Belt areas separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

- I object to any change of the settlement/village boundary reducing Green Belt as it would not only harm the openness and permanence of the Green Belt but would allow further applications for development on green fields. These fields serve the purposes of the Green Belt (para. 79-80), and also represent prime farm land. This would be contrary to a commitment in the local plan to protect Green Belt in the borough.

- the total of the four sites in Horsley breach NPPF 81 which encourages access to Green Belt for use of its amenity and recreation value

- these remaining policies will unnecessarily urbanise and be detrimental to the rural character of the Horsleys with no exceptional circumstances for this having been given in the plan. This justifies the continuing objection from residents. I would urge the plan to adopt the previous positive planning that protects the Green Belt first and foremost.
-although the new plan puts great emphasis on need for adequate facilities and infrastructure to support development, this
has not been stated in any new wording related to the Horsleys and therefore has failed to address the local concerns and
objections. The plan merely presents the prospect that there will be harm to both villages and resulting in harm to the
Green Belt itself.

- the plan to allow the density of new housing as still presented in the amendments is still too great and inappropriate for
the locality.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1740  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I Object to Policy A36.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3948  Respondent: 11101345 / Katja Schilling-Bayley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

I OBJECT to the changes to Policies A36 to A41 (East and West Horsley)

- The number of potential development sites has been reduced by MERELY TWO (A36 and A41, representing a
total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.
- Marginal changes such as these would still leave 70% of all new development in the borough built on Green Belt
sites. No “exceptional circumstances” or any other justification is advanced for this strange imbalance.
- The deletion of two Horsley sites fails to correct the issue of relative overdevelopment in East and West Horsley,
which is both excessive in absolute terms and disproportionate in relation to the rest of the borough.
- The plan fails to mention most of the known sustainability issues and infrastructure constraints affecting the
Horsley sites, including public transport, traffic, road safety, parking, schooling, medical facilities, sewage,
flooding/surface drainage and shops. These were fully set out in responses to last year’s public consultation.
- The density of new housing on the four Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the
locality at present. Collectively, the four Horsley sites breach NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to
the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/659  Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I Object

This is an area of outstanding beauty and will be ruined by this unsympathetic development. It is not in keeping with local housing.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/863  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

I OBJECT TO site A36 hotel plot in East Horsley.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/884  Respondent: 15247265 / Aileen Aitcheson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

1. SITES POLICIES

Of the many sites policies set out in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, I comment upon those in East Horsley as well as several in the surrounding area which may affect the village.

Five East Horsley sites are identified in GBC’s Land Availability Assessment (‘LAA’), two of which are allocated under policies in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The adjacent parish of West Horsley has six sites identified in the LAA, four of which are allocated in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Our comments on these site policies are as follows:

POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

I am concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. However, assuming that the employment loss can be justified, (which is a condition of Policy A36), then I am broadly supportive of housing...
development at this location, providing it is done in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent landmark position at the entrance to the village. The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting.

Whilst I endorse many of the requirements set out in Policy A36, my principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

I would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density.

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

Attached documents:
POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

I object to the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting.

The number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings, an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1448  Respondent: 15323041 / Jane Doherty  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

My principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

I would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density more in keeping with the character of the village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1785  Respondent: 15348705 / Richard Shaw  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Thatcher’s Hotel site is situated on a double-bend in the A246 adjacent to the B2039 that leads towards East Horsley village. It is already a dangerous and congested location, and the proposed development would increase these problems.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2562  Respondent: 15406177 / Leonilla Frost  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
I am writing for formally and strongly object to the 2016 Draft Local Plan. Please see my comments outlined below.

I OBJECT to Policy A36: Hotel, Guildford Road, East Horsley - site for approx 48 new homes
- My family and I regularly use this site for boarding and leisure, it would be terrible if it were replaced

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

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO 6 POLICIES: A36, A37, A38, A39, A40 & A41:

- Amount of new housing far exceeds local
- Housing density excessive when compared with existing
- Would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made.
- No local support
- Collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough not Should not be treated as isolated, separate sites.
- Total amount of new building out of scale with the plan ned development elsewhere the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas not protected by Green Belt
- Sites Key infrastructure Jacking. No adequate provision is made to increase it -e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding.
- No account taken of additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on Horsleys.
- Extension of settlement boundaries too permissive. Horsleys characterised by streets with development along only one side of the Policies allow too many adjacent green fields to be developed by squaring off boundaries and claiming they don't contribute to Green Belt "open ness".
- Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on.
- Will harm compliance with NPPF 81- e. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of G range Park Opera's new "Theatre in the Woods".
- Policy A40 especially unviable because of high water table and poor drainage, leading to regular winter
- Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to flooding, high speed limits, poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties, inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren, increasing use by recreational cyclists etc.

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

Attached documents:

---
Policy A36 proposes to re-develop the current Thatcher’s Hotel for housing.

I am concerned about the loss of this long-standing village hotel and significant employer. However, assuming that the employment loss can be justified, (which is a condition of Policy A36), then I am broadly supportive of housing development at this location, providing it is done in a manner that is in keeping with its prominent landmark position at the entrance to the village. The site is also close to the East Horsley Conservation Area and housing designs and site configuration must reflect the sensitivity of this setting.

Whilst we endorse many of the requirements set out in Policy A36, our principal concern is over the number of houses proposed for this site - approximately 48 dwellings. This number gives an implied gross housing density of 37 dwellings per hectare, which is exceptionally high for this location. The average housing density across the East Horsley Settlement Area is 8.1 dwellings per hectare and the highest density found in any of the roads around this location is 13 dwellings per hectare.

I would only support development at this location if it has a significantly lower housing density.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4163</th>
<th>Respondent: 15475649 / Joanne Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of new housing far exceeds local need and the housing density is excessive when compared with existing development. This would transform the Horsleys into a sizable town, something for which no case is made. There is absolutely no local support and the collective impact of these 6 sites on a small part of the borough has not been considered. They certainly should not be treated as isolated, separate sites. In addition, the total amount of new building is out of scale with the planned development elsewhere in the borough, especially less sensitive urban areas that are not protected by Green Belt. The sites listed above are totally unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| As mentioned previously, the key infrastructure is lacking and no adequate provision is made to increase it – e.g. poor wastewater capacity, lack of schools, absence of traffic management plan, flooding. In addition, no account has been taken of the additional impact of Wisley Airfield site on East and West Horsley and the Green Belt gap with neighbouring settlements will be hugely narrowed, especially if Wisley Airfield is built on. The compliance with NPPF 81 will also be harmed – e.g. by making cycling (including Prudential cycle races) too dangerous, ruining the rural setting of Waterloo Farm campsite, destroying the ambience of Grange Park Opera’s new “Theatre in the Woods”.
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3441</th>
<th>Respondent: 15583841 / Catherine Young</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In particular I OBJECT to the continued inclusion of sites A36 to 41 (East and West Horsley). The latest version of the proposed Local Plan reduces the number of sites proposed in this area but 4 remain with a proposed total of 395 new homes. This to me is not in proportion to the rest of the Borough. There seems to me to be no regard to the impact that this number of new homes will have on the immediate area, given also the proposed number of new homes at Site A35 only 2 miles away. In addition the density of new housing proposed on these sites is far too high compared to that of the local area and no regard appears to have been given to this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3449  Respondent: 15583841 / Catherine Young  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular I OBJECT to the continued inclusion of sites A36 to 41 (East and West Horsley). The latest version of the proposed Local Plan reduces the number of sites proposed in this area but 4 remain with a proposed total of 395 new homes. This to me is not in proportion to the rest of the Borough. There seems to me to be no regard to the impact that this number of new homes will have on the immediate area, given also the proposed number of new homes at Site A35 only 2 miles away. In addition the density of new housing proposed on these sites is far too high compared to that of the local area and no regard appears to have been given to this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6326  Respondent: 15588801 / Elizabeth Adams  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A36: Hotel, Guildford Road

The Thatcher’s Hotel is something of a landmark in East Horsley and to those who pass through.

Policy D3: Historic Environment of the draft plan states that

“Guildford borough’s historic environment is intrinsically part of what makes Guildford the place it is, that it acknowledges the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation can bring to our community and that it will conserve and enhance the historic environment in a manner appropriate to its significance.”

It further states that:

“Heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and works which would cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset, whether designated or non-designated, or its setting, will not be permitted without a clear justification to show that the public benefits of the proposal considerably outweigh any harm to the significance or special interest of the heritage asset in question.”

I OBJECT to this policy as I believe that The Thatcher Hotel is part of this historic environment and that this policy runs contrary to Policy D3.
Furthermore Policy E6: The leisure and visitor experience. States:

“The loss of existing visitor, leisure and cultural attractions, including arts and entertainment facilities, hotels and indoor sports venues, will be strongly resisted unless replacement facilities of an equivalent or better standard and provision are proposed in a location equally accessible to the facility’s current catchment area.”

The Thatcher Hotel attracts visitors to the area by providing accommodation and restaurant facilities. It also caters for those wishing to hold receptions, parties etc. by providing rooms for this sort of thing. Therefore it is surely a visitor attraction. forth.

Therefore I OBJECT to this policy as it runs contrary to Policy E6

Furthermore the density of houses proposed for this site (37 dph ) is much higher than currently exists within East Horsley (8.1 dph). According to the local parish council the highest density found locally to the proposed site is 13 dwellings per hectare.

The proposed dph is therefore approximately 5 times the average in the village, which I think is very high for this location.

Thus, I OBJECT to Policy A36 on the grounds that it is out of keeping with local character, context and distinctiveness, and therefore breaches the NPPF and emerging GBC Policy H1.

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

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7820  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A36

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

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

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

### Comment ID: pslp172/2204  Respondent: 17301377 / Amanda Obrien  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

I object to the new local plan, my reasons are as follows;

Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley)

This submission focuses on changes made to the 2016 draft Local Plan. In the case of Sites A36-41, the changes are minimal. This ignores the high volume of serious objections submitted to this part of the plan.

The number of potential development sites has been reduced by two (A36 and A41, representing a total of 138 dwellings). This leaves four sites (A27-40) which still represent a total of 395 new dwellings.

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

### Comment ID: pslp172/2680  Respondent: 17340193 / Surya Hotels (S Dulai)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

The Councils latest AMR suggests a housing supply of a little over 2 years, which reflects a persistent failure to address the OAN. The calculation of 5YHLS takes account of sites identified in the SHLAA but which do not benefit from planning permission or an allocation. Site A36 is one of the sites that it is suggested could be drought forward within 5 years.

The site is available and could be developed for housing within 5 years.

The site is allocated for residential development in the submission draft of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

The site should be reinstated as a housing allocation in the Local Plan, in part to reflect the putative Neighbourhood Plan allocation.

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3793</th>
<th>Respondent: 17340193 / Surya Hotels (S Dulai)</th>
<th>Agent: Stuart Willsher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lanpro Services are acting on behalf of Surya Hotels in relation to their Thatcher’s Hotel site in East Horsley, who have instructed Lanpro to review the current Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites Consultation Document.

It is appreciated that Guildford Council are only seeking comments, at this stage, on the changes that it is proposing to make to the plan and on the new and updated evidence base. As such, these comments will focus on the proposed changes to The Horsleys – East Horsley (south) and Horsleys – East Horsley Proposals Maps. Lanpro are supportive of the changes made to the proposals maps.

The Thatcher’s Hotel, East Horsley

The Hotel extends to an area of approximately 1.6 hectares on the edge of the village of East Horsley.

The site is currently occupied by Thatcher’s Legacy Hotel with its associated car parking and landscaped areas. It is accessed from the A246 Epsom/Guildford Road which runs to the west and south of the site.

The topography of the site generally slopes gently upwards from north to south with a slightly steeper incline towards the southeast corner. Current site levels on the southern boundary are generally lower than those of the adjacent A246. There is well established natural vegetation around the site, particularly to the south and west along the perimeter boundary. The site does not contain any Public Rights of Way or bridleways.

The site in its entirety measures approximately 1.6 hectares. The footprint of the existing buildings cover an area of 0.24 hectares, which is approximately 14.5% of the overall site. Hard standing accounts for a further 0.39 hectares, which is approximately 24.5% of the total site area. The existing built form and hard standing combined cover 0.63 hectares, approximately 39% of the overall site.

The remainder of the site that is not occupied by the built form or development includes areas of grass, vegetation, signage, lighting and more formal garden seating areas closer to the building.

A part full, part outline application for the substantive demolition of the hotel buildings and change of use of the retained parts from hotel use (C1) to residential use (C3) (full application) and the erection of dwellings (outline application) to provide a total of up to 49 new dwellings was dismissed at Appeal on 9th February 2017 (Council Ref. 15/P/02354, PINS Ref. APP/Y3615/W/16/3158653).

The Horsleys – East Horsley (south) and Horsleys – East Horsley Proposals Maps

It is noted that the Local Plan proposes a number of changes to the proposals map, including:

- Removal of site allocation A36 (The Thatcher’s Hotel);
- Alterations to the Green Belt Boundary; and
- Alterations to the identified settlement boundary, to include the whole village settlement area.
Settlement Boundary

We support changes made to the identified settlement boundary, including removing East Horsley, particularly The Thatcher’s Hotel site, from the Green Belt. These changes will give clarity and certainty in supporting a wider range of uses regarding either the expansion or redevelopment of the existing hotel use, or the future redevelopment of the site.

Site Allocation A36

With regards to site allocation A36, it is noted that the Council’s principal reason for removing the hotel is due to, “insufficient evidence to demonstrate the loss of the hotel.” Following the refusal of the earlier scheme in 2017, the owners of the site are considering their next steps regarding the redevelopment of the hotel, which is likely to include providing further evidence to address the Inspector’s views on this issue. As such, it is possible that further evidence to justify the allocation could be available prior to the Examination In Public to support the redevelopment of the hotel.

Furthermore, it is noted that the most recent draft of the East Horsley Neighbourhood Plan, published 21st March 2017 (and after the Inspector’s decision), retains this site as an allocation for housing development (as Site 4). Policy H6 of the Neighbourhood Plan proposes an allocation of up to 22 dwellings, providing that the loss of the hotel facility must be appropriately justified in the planning application in accordance with the applicable local plan.

The changes proposed to the East Horsley Proposals Map does not identify a replacement allocation for the 22 dwellings proposed by The Thatcher’s Hotel site. As such, we would suggest that an alternative approach to this site could be to retain the allocation on the basis that it may facilitate the expansion/improvement/ diversification of the hotel to make it viable as enabling development, or retain the allocation to enable the redevelopment of the hotel site, depending on the site only being developable when the Local Authority is satisfied that the loss of the hotel has been justified, following the further work being done to look at demand and supply of bed spaces and the overall short to medium term viability of the hotel.

Development Proposal for The Thatcher’s Hotel

As with the previously refused scheme, it is considered that the site can accommodate up to 49 dwellings.

Any proposed development would involve the demolition of the majority of the existing hotel and outbuildings, with the exception of the original Chown building, which could be retained and converted into private flats. 35% of the proposed dwellings would be provided as affordable.

Development of this site would comply with general NPPF policies relating to the use of brownfield sites, specifically paragraph 111 which states that, “planning policies and decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed.”

Summary

Lanpro supports the alterations proposed to the settlement and Green Belt boundary as it would allow for the redevelopment of the hotel and its wider site. However, we would welcome the retention of the site allocation A36, to support the redevelopment and expansion of the hotel site.

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

Attached documents:
Site Policy A36 Thatchers Hotel East Horsley site is no longer in the Local Plan and I support its’ removal for housing development and believe there is a case for retaining the current use as a Hotel.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4873  **Respondent:** 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  **Agent:** Savills (Richard Hill)

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A36

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42323</td>
<td>Site 4 Thatcher's Hotel</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Attached documents:**

Total records: 94.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A37 - Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to you with regard to the Proposed Local Plan, as I am the owner of [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], which constitutes part of one sites in the plan allocated for development, namely of A37: Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley on pages 209 and 210 of the plan.

Whilst I am not educated in land development matters I feel is important you have input from a homeowner and village resident whose circumstances will be affected by the proposed plan.

Initially, I write to state that I wholeheartedly support the plan. Whilst my family and I enjoy living in West Horsley, and enjoy the delights of a semi-rural environment, we have long felt that the area should be sharing the national burden for housing and that is unacceptable to continue to "fight off development" and expect other locations to deal with the challenge. Furthermore if we are to sustain our rural villages into the future we need to ensure that there is sufficient and suitable housing that encourages young people and families to live in them.

It is clear to me that Guildford Borough Council's plan has been well researched and thought through, and offers the best solution for increased housing whilst protecting the rural feel of the borough. Infill between existing dwellings, on sites such as ours, are definitely more acceptable than extending village boundaries into large areas of open fields.

The plans to make West Horsley an inset village, and specifically the allocation of the site we form part of are both sensible and executable such that the majority of the site is away from public gaze, and can be developed in a sensitive way, in-keeping with the context of the village, to provide suitable additional housing required, and contribute to the Council's housing requirements.

As I am sure you are already aware, the site is made up of land owned by four different people. I have marked up the owners, including myself, on the diagram below:-

I am in dialogue with [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] and [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], both of whom have confirmed that they are keen to develop their land either individually, or together .

I myself am agreeable to development [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], individually or as part of the whole plot, including road access either through my plot from The Street, or via Bell and Colvill.

It should be noted, for reference, that I have a pre-emption agreement with Mr Witherby, since his land was originally part of [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], that should he come to sell his land I have first option to purchase his land. Since the publication of the draft plan, I have been approached by a number of "developers" and "land agents/ consultants", all of whom have formulated plans which suggest between five and seven houses of three to four bedroom size and a similar number on the land adjoining [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] owned by [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] (red and green areas on the diagram above) could be built in line with planning regulations.
The houses' design and appearance would be in keeping with the village, thus retaining the village's integrity and character.

My current position is that I would look to move plans forward quickly in consultation with the Council planning department as soon as possible, within the confines of the Local Plan coming into force.

With specific reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, I am flexible as to whether the site falls within the 6-10 year timescale for the wider site development, or it can be developed on a smaller scale as either just [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998], or to include the adjoining land within the shorter timescales of 0-5 years.

Additional factors that make the site both suitable and attractive for development are:-

- It is not agricultural land
- It is not contaminated by previous use such as a former industrial site
- It would not require change of use as it has an existing dwelling and outbuildings
- Direct access to the public highway can be provided from The Street
- It does not represent a major site, and therefore will have minimal effect on biodiversity
- The site is solely under my ownership

In summary I firmly believe that the site can be developed quickly, and in keeping with the character of the village to support the Council's need to provide additional suitable housing in the Borough, and I would very much like to keep it in the plan as available for development.

I fully support the plan and the inclusion of our site and if I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

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

Attached documents: Capture3.JPG (92 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/5430  Respondent: 8555777 / A Back  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A37

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

With regard to site A37 in the plan. I am one of the landowners and would like to re-state my support for the proposed development of the site. I understand that the phasing has been amended for the site and is now due for delivery in the first 5 years of the plan. Again I am in full support of this and believe the site can easily be delivered in that timescale.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7916  Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

Sites Policies A37 to A41
Report page: 18

WHPC view: Objects strongly

In brief: All the West Horsley Sites are unsustainable, as demonstrated in the Planning Assessment Report (Appendix 2) when evaluated against NPPF Policies

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4296</th>
<th>Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A37 land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley

177. I object to this site being i Guildford Borough Council have proposed moving the settlement boundary and insetting the enlarged village in order to allow a development for which there are no exceptional circumstances. Much of the site is greenfield, close to buildings of historic interest and is in a rural location in full view of visitors to the area. The proposed development pays no respect to its setting.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7931</th>
<th>Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch &amp; Guildford District (Tim Harrold)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPRE OBJECTION TO HORSLEY SITES A37, A38, A39, A40, & A41

CPRE objects to the proposal for six main development sites in the two attractive communities of East and West Horsley. Altogether these add up to more than some 535 new houses. Both villages are currently washed over by the Green Belt. The new development will be made possible by means of “insetting” which CPRE opposes in the draft Local Plan as it facilitates the growth of communities such as these which are together distinguished by their openness within a rural area. CPRE also objects to the extension of the settlement boundary south of the A246 and the progression of linear development towards Effingham and Ockham where the development of 2,000 houses is being proposed for the former Wisley airfield only some 2 miles away.

There are a range of constraints which have to be taken into account when reviewing these new proposals but have been ignored in the draft local plan. We are informed, for example, that Thames Water has advised GBC that the current wastewater network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all this ambitious and
unexpected development growth. If this were to go ahead, the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will not be able to cope and would have to be upgraded through substantial investment.

The proposed expansion of housing on this scale will lead to major problems in terms of educational school provision. The following schools in the area are already operating at near or full capacity: Raleigh School, the Howard of Effingham School, and the private Glenesk and Cranmore Schools. It should be remembered that children in Ripley are currently having to be sent to schools in Shearwater in Woking and even to Addlestone.

Surrey County Council has published no plans for creating further school places for children of all ages for the Horsleys, or for the traffic management and environmental improvement scheme they have promised between 2019 and 2023.

CPRE objects to the volume of high density new housing proposed for the Horsleys which amounts to some 35% more homes because it will harm the character, identity, and setting of these villages. NPPF requires that new residential development must respect these elements of the community environment which will be entirely lost by building on the scale envisaged and should be limited drastically to take account of the infrastructure deficit.

The heritage buildings at Hatchlands belonging to the National Trust, and at West Horsley Place, where the new proposal for the Grange “Opera in the Woods” has been approved by GBC, must be protected against what appears likely to be unsustainable development which will overwhelm the local community environment for ever. West and East Horsley will be swamped with extra cars and people using the shops, stations, village halls, sports facilities, medical services, parking space and public transport. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF makes clear that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. We do not agree with the draft Local Plan that this community should be a candidate for “insetting” to facilitate development on the scale suggested. We object to what is proposed and will oppose any suggestion that “exceptional circumstances” justify amending the Green Belt boundary in the way described at this draft Local Plan consultation as we consider this approach unsound.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/894  Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett  Agent:

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

The Bell & Coleville site is suitable for housing development, but these plans seem to include a large tract of land behind the brownfield site. Every time an extra field is taken into building part of the rural nature of the Horsleys disappears for ever. The actual site of the garage, showroom and parking should be redeveloped, but no more.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8241  Respondent: 8671969 / Valerie Thompson  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7713</th>
<th>Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the allocation of Bell &amp; Colville, WH – allocation A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1206</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object. Site in Greenbelt and should be protected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object, Site in Conservation Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/102</th>
<th>Respondent: 8792193 / Brian Wolfe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4. Policies A37, A38, A40 &amp; A41 in West Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.1. The LAA has identified 6 sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these 6 sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a significant increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormous proportional increase by any standards.

5.4.2. The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly Brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these Settlement Boundary movements appear highly questionable and in no way meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in exceptional circumstances. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of Settlement Boundaries in order to provide more Greenfield sites for housing development.

5.4.3. The only point in favour relates two of the sites one being partly brown field and back infill of earlier ribbon development and the other are small paddocks used for grazing horses. It is stretching the rules nevertheless to justify removing them from the Green belt. The infilling proposed will create a hard edge interface with the countryside for which there could be little justification or mitigation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/380  Respondent:  8820929 / A J Stuart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

Bell & Colvill Garage (Ref. A37, ID16) is, again a very busy road intersection where Cranmore School traffic queues daily obstructing and completely blocking the road for all other users every morning and evening. To add a further possible 40 houses, so perhaps 80 more vehicles into this already busy area is in my view absurd and irresponsible. There are children who are forced to walk down Shere Road, where there are no pavements, or street lights, or central marking, and they already have to dodge the fast paced traffic, then cross the main A246 to catch their school bus (to the nearest secondary state school). To exacerbate the traffic volumes is making an already bad situation worse.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1506  Respondent:  8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

Traffic flow, due to a combination of regular daily traffic combined with access and departure from Cranmore School (450 pupils), has long been a major problem and any additional homes and associated cars in this immediate vicinity will cause havoc. Similary, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by not nothing more than a small lay-by with no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built that will inevitably mean an additional 100 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS against this proposal but do not object to it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Site A37: Bell & Colville Garage, West Horsley (40 houses)**

Traffic flow, due to a combination of regular daily traffic combined with access and departure from Cranmore School (450 pupils), has long been a major problem and any additional homes and associated cars in this immediate vicinity will cause havoc. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by with no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built that will inevitably mean an additional 100 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold **SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS** against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3127  **Respondent:** 8837377 / J Fisher  **Agent:**

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

I have no objections to the Bell & Colvill site and Thatchers sites, as the impact would be a manageable. I feel the rest is a ridiculous waste of time and money on the part of the Council.

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

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8252  **Respondent:** 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  **Agent:**

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

I OBJECT to policy A37. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/997</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object. I believe it is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4147</th>
<th>Respondent: 8858657 / Oliver Cass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am comfortable that the loss of the garage would not significantly adversely impact West Horsley. As with site A36 above, I am also of the view that this is already a developed site (e, brownfield) it represents the type of site the Council should be looking to develop rather than seeking out entirely greenfield sites.

A condition of the development would have to be to ensure the local surface water flooding problems after the development were reduced compared to the problems currently being experience, ie, the development would need to include significant investment in upgrading the drainage infrastructure for the areas affected by the development.

If there is to be development then I would not object to development at this site, with the condition that the drainage infrastructure is upgraded as set out above.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6955</th>
<th>Respondent: 8858913 / Stephen Carter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A37, A38, A40, A41 located in West Horsley

The four proposed sites, totalling 385 dwellings, all lie within the Green Belt at the edge of the settlement area. For a village with approximately 1100 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents an increase of 35% over the plan period, an enormously high percentage by any standards.

The justification for making changes to the settlement boundaries in order to meet unfulfilled housing need as suggested in the Green Belt and Countryside Study commissioned by GBC is questionable since the NPPF states that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by 'exceptional circumstances'. The boundary movements clearly represent an decision to push back the boundaries to provide more greenfield sites for housing development.
Boundary movements are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green Belt. West Horsley and the adjacent village of Ockham (where development at the former Wisley Airfield is also proposed) represent the first line of defence against the urban sprawl of London outside the M25 circle. By seeking to expand settlement boundaries and infilling on any green space in these rural locations means this 'line of defence' is eliminated.

The premise in Policy P2 of the Local Plan: 'We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt therefore seems completely opposite to what is proposed for West Horsley (and all other villages whose settlement boundaries are proposed to be altered).

Village expansion on the scale being suggested for West Horsley will not be sustainable. There is only one small shop at the southern end of the village, no post office and a bus service which operates on a very limited weekday basis. The high volume of new housing would add to the already overstretched facilities in East Horsley which both East and West Horsley residents already use. Traffic generation will be considerably worse on the roads, and even worse if the Wisley Airfield proposal is included as Horsley station would be one of two stations closest to this development and parking is already at a premium during the week. It is fanciful for the Local Plan (or indeed the developers for Wisley Airfield) to suggest that commuters will cycle to the station in anything other than very small numbers.

The roads are unlit, many are narrow and winding in nature and have poor sightlines with concealed driveways (including my own).

Given the scale of the proposed development in West Horsley, the inevitable loss of village character and the impact on the infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I OBJECT to the site Policies A37, A38, A40, A41.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6506  Respondent: 8887265 / Harvey Weller  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

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

I OBJECT to POLICIES A37, A38, A40 & A41, given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley. The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1505  Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Traffic flow, due to a combination of regular daily traffic combined with access and departure from Cranmore School (450 pupils), has long been a major problem and any additional homes and associated cars in this immediate vicinity will cause havoc. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by with no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built that will inevitably mean an additional 100 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold **SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS** against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7450  **Respondent:** 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

**Site A37: Bell & Colville Garage, West Horsley (40 houses)**

Traffic flow, due to a combination of regular daily traffic combined with access and departure from Cranmore School (450 pupils), has long been a major problem and any additional homes and associated cars in this immediate vicinity will cause havoc. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by with no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built that will inevitably mean an additional 100 cars based on an average of 2.5 cars per property. For these reasons, I hold **SIGNIFICANT RESERVATIONS** against this proposal but do not object to it.

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

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3267  **Respondent:** 8895233 / Clare Axten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

1. **Effects on Travelling**

   The time it takes to drive to the station from my home to Horsley station is already protracted due to high traffic volumes around East Lane/Ockham Road South, particularly during school drop-off times.

   The addition of a further 385 houses in the immediate area will make matters markedly worse, and from talking to officers in the GBC planning department, no traffic analyses or journey time assessments have yet been earned out to determine the extent.

   The station car park is already full on most working days, and there is no apparent means of expanding it.

   The trains are becoming increasingly more intensively used, and the proposed addition of an extra station at Merrow is likely to lead to even more congestion and uncomfortable conditions for passengers further up the line.

   How is it to be expected that developers will be able to mitigate these effects (under sustainable Transport Policy i3)?

   1. **Access to Shops and Local Facilities**
No thought has been given to the increased parking demand resulting from these developments. Parking at the shops in any of the three retail areas is already difficult at the best of times. Has anyone carried out an assessment of the implications of adding a possible 700 more cars in East and West Horsley? No, of course not.

Recruitment of doctors to work in GP surgeries is known to be a national problem and the local medical centre is already increasingly stretched, going by lengthening waiting times for appointments. How is GBG going to address this issue? It can't.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7784  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

I object to the allocation of Bell & Colville, WH – allocation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4319  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

Site A37 - Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7215  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.
There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7908</th>
<th>Respondent: 8958145 / Shrimplin Brown (James Brown)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPRESENTATIONS BY BELL AND COLVILL LTD ON THE GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN STRATEGY AND SITES; JUNE 2016.

**Introduction**

ShrimplinBrown Ltd are instructed by Bell and Colvill Ltd (B&C, Our client) to submit the following representations to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites document, June 2016.

ShrimplinBrown have undertaken a comprehensive review of the Draft Guildford Local Plan document as well as the relevant supporting evidence base. In accordance with the guidance set out within the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2012, the following representations relate specifically to the “legal compliance” and “soundness” of the draft Local Plan. As well as the specific tests of soundness set out in the NPPF.

These representations should be read in conjunction with the attached summary information and Design and Access Statement drawn from the recent planning application and which provides further analysis of the site capacity for land at Bell and Colvill together with assessment and justification of site potential.

For ease of reference we have set out our representations within this single document which addresses the relevant questions set out within the questionnaire and makes clear references to specific; paragraphs, policies and site allocations within the draft plan.

A completed copy of the Council’s Questionnaire is also enclosed.

**QUESTION 1: THE EVIDENCE BASE AND SUBMISSION DOCUMENTS**

The majority of the Evidence Base is considered robust, although the Council have not published an update on CIL. This will be a key document in assessing and evaluating the deliverability of sites and other plan commitments, in particular the level of affordable housing sought from new development.

Our Client is concerned that the 40% target for affordable housing provision has been determined on the basis of assumptions from the Preliminary Draft of the CIL Charging Schedule. Furthermore, the affordable housing threshold does not take account of National Guidance (see additional comments on Policy H2 below).

UN SOUND There is insufficient JUSTIFICATION for the affordable housing policy which is based on an outdated Evidence Base and which is not based on up to date information in relation to CIL. The Policy is also inconsistent with National Guidance.

**QUESTION 2 AND 3: LEGAL COMPLIANCE AND SOUNDNESS**

As a whole our Client considers that the Local Plan may be deemed to be legally compliant and sound subject to comments in relation to specific policies which for ease of reference we consider in turn below.
As a general point we are concerned that the Council have failed to “…assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards…” (Paragraph 174 of the NPPF).

In particular our Client has concerns regarding the cumulative impact of; Affordable Homes (Policy H2); Policy D1 (Making Better Places); Policy D2 (Sustainable Design, Construction and Energy) and the Council’s future proposals for CIL (only a preliminary charging schedule currently published)

The wider conformity with National guidance is considered individually below in our responses to individual policies.

QUESTION 4: DUTY TO COOPERATE

Our Client have no specific comments to make on the Duty to Co-operate at this stage.

QUESTION 5: EXAMINATION

Our Client wishes to reserve the right to attend the Examination. They are the owners of land which is included in Site Allocation A37- Land at and to the rear of Bell and Colvill, Epsom Road, West Horsley and thus wish to reserve the right to attend the Examination in order to clarify any details relating to the site allocation, site capacity or to present evidence relating to any policies which could impact on the effective delivery of the allocation.

QUESTION 6: THE CONTENT OF THE PLAN

Our Client wishes to make the following comments on the Draft Plan.

POLICY H2: AFFORDABLE HOMES

Our Client is supportive of the need to make appropriate provision for affordable housing, however, they wish to make the following specific comments in relation to; the viability and justification of the affordable housing target set out within Policy H2.

Compliance with National Guidance

The Council’s policy does not take account of Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031- 20160519 of the NPPG.

This states that there are specific circumstances where contributions for affordable housing and tariff style planning obligations (section 106 planning obligations) should not be sought from small scale and self-build development. This follows the order of the Court of Appeal dated 13 May 2016, which give legal effect to the policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 28 November 2014 and should be taken into account.

These circumstances are that;

• Contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm
• In designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The clear intention and wording of the Ministerial Statement is to ensure that smaller scale development (10 units or less) are not burdened by the need to provide affordable housing or other contributions. This must clearly apply to both financial contributions as well as on-site provision.

For the avoidance of doubt a lower threshold should only be applied in ‘rural areas’ which meet the definition in the Housing Act. This should not include sites within defined settlement boundaries i.e. a lower threshold would not be appropriate within the revised West Horsley settlement boundary. Furthermore, our Client cannot, however, see any
grounds for a lower target to be applied anyway in the Borough and indeed there is no support for such an approach from the Council’s evidence base.

The Local Plan does not reference the Ministerial Statement and relies on Evidence Base which pre-date the Court of Appeal Decision. The Guildford Borough Council Local Plan Viability and Affordable Housing Study, Final Report, December 2014 references the relevant National Guidance at 2.2.7 to 2.2.12, however, no justification is provided for setting aside the policy provision.

Flexibility in the application of the target

Although it is agreed that, where possible, a sufficient level of affordable housing should be provided on site, this should be subject to viability considerations and should, on a site specific basis, take into consideration other regeneration benefits or sites costs. The policy should include a greater degree of inherent flexibility to specifically recognise the need for reduced levels of on-site provision or off-site contributions on sites that would otherwise be undeliverable.

The Council must be certain that the affordable housing target that is ultimately adopted is realistically attainable and will not hold back development. The policy should also include safeguards to prevent the policy being rigidly applied and being used as a brake on development.

Setting the affordable housing target

We understand the pressing need for affordable housing within the District and overall our Client supports the approach to extend the requirement across a wider range of sites, taking account of the National limitations on sites of 10 units or less. Our Client considers that the threshold should be set at 11 units. There is also no justification for setting an additional size threshold of 0.17 hectares.

It is deemed appropriate that the Council have adopted a level playing field by setting a single fixed target, however, the 40% level is deemed unrealistic particularly in the context that affordable housing completions as a proportion of total supply have only hit 31% of the period 2008-2013. This is without the added burden of a CIL charge.

It is considered that the proportion of affordable housing should remain at 35% with clear flexibility written into the policy to reduce this when development otherwise be unviable.

The policy should also clarify that the affordable threshold should be derived on a ‘net increase of units’ to enable the offset of existing housing stock.

Off-site contributions

The policy text makes no provision for off-site contributions which will be essential on some smaller and medium size schemes (11 units or more) to ensure that they are workable, viable and ultimately deliverable. To be robust the policy must include a specific mechanism within the policy wording to allow offsite contributions in appropriate circumstances. Reference is made to this at paragraphs 4.2.36 – 4.2.37, however, there needs to be a specifically included within the policy text.

Any formula must also be tested and subject to public consultation and should not be left for publication as supplementary guidance.

It must also be recognised that alternative sites cannot always be identified and it is unrealistic to specify that land values for affordable housing must always be provided at nil value.

It is considered that the statement at paragraph 4.2.38 that ‘the vast majority of development in most locations in the Borough are viable providing an affordable housing contribution of 40 per cent.’ Is misleading. The viability work is based on specific scenarios and it is not considered that this provides a reliable basis for the threshold and percentage adopted.
In order to ensure that development comes forward in the short term the approach outlined at paragraph 4.2.39 may only realistically be applied once the plan, and any CIL charge has been adopted. Where land has been acquired or options signed in advance the Council should adopt greater discretion in negotiations.

Finally, Affordable housing is a dynamic sector and accordingly the Council should ensure that this policy does not prejudice the delivery of; key worker or Private Rented Sector schemes which can make schemes in their entirety more accessible.

UNSOUND: The published Affordable Housing Evidence Base is not considered to provide the necessary justification for the 40% target. The target should be reduced to 35%

No justification is provided for setting aside the National Policy which limits the requirement for affordable housing on sites of 10 units or less. The threshold should be set at sites of 11 units or more, and no site size threshold should be included.

Flexibility must be included within the policy wording to enable the negotiation of off-site affordable housing contributions.

POLICY P2: GREEN BELT

Our Client fully supports the proposal to inset villages from the Green Belt, including West Horsley. This is essential to ensure that the Council maximise the opportunities for housing delivery, particularly in the earlier years of the Local Plan.

SUPPORT POLICY

POLICY P5: THAMES BASIN HEATHS SPECIAL PROTECTION AREAS

Our Client considers that in assessing the requirement for mitigation within five and seven kilometres of the SPA the threshold of 50 net new dwellings is too low and would place a further unreasonable restriction on development.

The supporting text states that 80% of visitors come from within seven kilometres of the SPA, however, this does not quantify the proportion from the outer reaches of the zone of influence (5-7 kilometres).

This consideration is more relevant to the larger strategic sites and it is suggested that a threshold of 100 or 150 units should be imposed. Furthermore, the uncertainty presented by the case by case assessment will curtail the delivery of sites and could stifle housing delivery.

UNSOUND: The assessment of schemes of 50 net new dwellings within 5-7 kilometres of the SPA is not JUSTIFIED and would threaten the EFFECTIVENESS of the Plan.

RECOMMENDED CHANGE: Increase the threshold to at least 100 units.

POLICY D4: DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN AREAS AND INSET VILLAGES

B&C fully support the proposed southern extension to West Horsley (As shown on the Proposals Map)

However, whilst the overall objectives of the policy guidance set out at Policy D4 are acknowledged and broadly supported by Our Client it is considered that the tone of the policy could serve to curtail rather than encourage the development of the specific site allocations identified in the Plan. Paragraph 4.5.46 suggests that the policy is targeted to windfall opportunities, however, the wording could still be applied to ‘all new development’ including site allocations. Our Client contend that this would undermine the delivery of Site Allocations and impact on the delivery of the Council’s housing target.

The expansion and development of edge of settlement sites will necessitate some changes in scale, massing and height. It will also be necessary to build at increased densities in order to ensure the most effective use of land. Whilst it will be important to ensure that new development successfully integrates within areas and does not impact on the amenities of
neighbours the Borough requires a step change in the delivery of housing, particularly in urban areas. As such
settlements and places will need to sensitively evolve.

UNSOUND: As currently drafted the policy will not be EFFECTIVE in securing the delivery of Site Allocations. It is
suggested that the policy is re-worded as follows.

“Development will be deemed acceptable in principle for all of the Site Allocations identified at pages 123-126. The
approximate site densities should be achieved wherever possible subject to compliance with other plan policies.

Other new development in the urban areas of Guildford, and Ash and Tongham, and inset villages should
• Be developed with reference to the layout, scale, form, massing, height and materials of surrounding buildings
  and structures;
• Take account of the existing grain and street pattern
• Conserve, and where possible enhance designated heritage assets
• Ensure that the amenities enjoyed by the occupants of buildings are protected.

To avoid confusion the policy should also specifically identify the Inset Village Areas where it is intended that this
criteria will be relevant. Similarly these criteria should not serve as a brake on the delivery of Site Allocations.

SITE ALLOCATION A37: LAND AT AND TO THE REAR OF BELL AND COLVILL, EPSOM ROAD, WEST
HORSLEY

The council’s decision to allocate land as part of Site Allocation A37 and the amendment to the village settlement
boundary is fully supported by the Evidence Base as follows:

LAA, February 2016

The LAA identified development potential for circa 40 houses on land encompassing the eastern part of the Bell and
Colvill site together with land to the north and west. In highlighting the potential of the site the LAA noted that the site is
very close to other residential properties and services in the village.

A Phase 1 contamination survey has been undertaken for the Bell and Colvill site which has shown that there is no
ground contamination which would prevent residential development.

The site is in Flood Zone 1. The LAA concludes that access from the A246 could be appropriately adapted.

The Bell and Colvill garage site is located outside of the conservation area.

Green Belt and Countryside Study, 2014

The Council have undertaken a detailed assessment of the Green Belt and Countryside across the entire Borough which
led to the proposed amendments to settlement boundaries set out in the Draft Plan including the proposed revisions to
include additional land to the north-west and south of West Horsley.

The enclosed finger of land comprising the Bell & Colvill garage site and land to the north was highlighted within the
document as a logical location for the extension of the settlement and has been carried forward to the Proposed
Submission Draft Plan.

Landscape and Character Assessment, 2007

The site is not within a sensitive location within the LACA and development of the site would contribute positively to
enhancing the characteristics of the Ockham and Clandon Wooded Rolling Claylands.

The development plot is well contained by the existing settlement and a firm defensible southern boundary created by the
Epsom Road. Development in this location will clearly not lead to fragmentation of the landscape.
Summary

Our Client supports the proposed allocation for up to 40 residential dwellings. Residential use is the most appropriate use for the site.

The Bell & Colvill site already functionally forms part of the settlement and the currently undeveloped land to the north is enclosed on all sides. The development of these sites would form a natural rounding off of the settlement and will offer opportunities to; build new housing, rationalise the existing Bell and Colvill business and strengthen boundary landscaping.

The Council’s evidence base work has clearly highlighted the appropriateness of directing new development to West Horsley (north and south) and this work supports the proposed amendment to the Settlement boundary and the specific allocation of the site for development.

Whilst planning permission was refused in January 2016 for a scheme of 9 units this decision was on the basis of current policy and is subject to an appeal. As set out in the LAA the decision was predominantly on the grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which will be addressed through the proposals in the Draft Local Plan, and as such does not have a bearing on this allocation. Further details relating to the application accompany these reps.

Landownership, the likely need to relocate part of the Bell and Colvill business, and the nature of the collective landholding mean that it is very unlikely that the entire Site Allocation will come forward as an entire block. Whilst the garage site is likely to be developed in isolation it could in the future facilitate access into the rear plot without undermining short term potential.

SUPPORT SITE ALLOCATION A37: LAND AT AND TO THE REAR OF BELL AND COLVILL, EPSOM ROAD, WEST HORSLEY INCLUDING THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE SOUTHERN EXTENT OF THE WEST HORSLEY SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY TO INCLUDE LAND AT B&C AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE SITE AS PART OF A WIDER OPPORTUNITY.

Land at Bell and Colvill (Part of Site Allocation A37)

A Planning Application was submitted in October 2015 for the following proposal:

“Construction of nine dwellings (two pairs of 3 bed semi-detached, two pairs of 4 bed semi-detached & 1 x 4 bed detached) with associated access improvements, car parking and landscaping following demolition of existing workshop, showroom, three residential properties and removal of hardstanding, on land at Bell & Colvill (Horsley) Ltd, Epsom Road, West Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 (LPA Ref: 15/P/02122).”

In pre-application discussions and during the course of the planning application the following detailed matters were confirmed by Guildford Borough Council and Statutory Consultees:

- The site represents in its entirety previously developed land where the principle of residential development is acceptable, subject to compliance with paragraph 89 of the NPPF1;
- Whilst outside of the currently identified settlement boundary the Council accept that it may be reasonably considered as part of the village of West Horsley;
- The site is within the 5km to 7km buffer of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area where development has no impact on the Special Protection Area;
- The proposals will not result in the loss of employment use but rather the reorganisation and rationalisation of space. The Council confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal in this regard;
- The existing built form on the site is of no architectural merit and there is no objection to its demolition;
- There would be no material harm to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area;
- There would be no harm to the residential amenity of existing or proposed residents;
- The proposed dwellings would be able to coincide with the retained Bell and Colvill site in an acceptable manner;
• The proposals would reduce the number of access points on to the access road and the proposed development would result in a slight decrease in vehicular movements. The County Highway Authority has not raised any objections in relation to highways Impact or the proposed Site Access;
• Each dwelling would be allocated two on-site car parking spaces which would meet the Council’s maximum standard;
• There are no protected species or habitats on site which would be adversely impacted by these proposals;
• There are no significant trees on the site and trees on neighbouring land may be protected by a condition to secure root protection measures;
• The application site is in Flood Zone 1;
• The site can be developed using sustainable urban drainage systems which may be secured by means of condition.

The Council determined under delegated powers to refuse the application on 13th January 2016 for two reasons:

1. The proposal represents the redevelopment of a previously developed site. However, due to the scale, bulk and massing of the proposed dwellings, particularly at first floor and roof level, the quantum of development, together with the proposed layout, the development would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development on the site. In addition, while the proposal may be considered to be located within a village, the development does not represent a limited infill. As such, the proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt which is harmful by definition. Furthermore, in itself, the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been put forward that would outweigh the inherent harm. As such, the proposal is contrary to policy RE2 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of the bulk, scale and design of the proposed buildings, along with the layout of the development, the proposal would detract from the character of the area. The proposal would result in an urban appearance, and which would represent a visually discordant and incongruous addition to the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Our Client strongly disagrees with the reasons for refusal and has submitted a planning appeal (Ref: APP/Y3615/W/16/3154084).

In any event neither of these reasons for refusal undermine the underlying principle of development on the site. The reasons relate specifically to the assessment of the particular proposals in its current context and under the limitations of current adopted and National policy.

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

Attached documents: Design and Access Statement.pdf (3.0 MB)
facilitates the growth of communities such as these which are together distinguished by their openness within a rural area. CPRE also objects to the extension of the settlement boundary south of the A246 and the progression of linear development towards Effingham and Ockham where the development of 2,000 houses is being proposed for the former Wisley airfield only some 2 miles away.

There are a range of constraints which have to be taken into account when reviewing these new proposals but have been ignored in the draft local plan. We are informed, for example, that Thames Water has advised GBC that the current wastewater network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from all this ambitious and unexpected development growth. If this were to go ahead, the foul drainage system all the way to the treatment works North of Ripley will not be able to cope and would have to be upgraded through substantial investment.

The proposed expansion of housing on this scale will lead to major problems in terms of educational school provision. The following schools in the area are already operating at near or full capacity: Raleigh School, the Howard of Effingham School, and the private Glenesk and Cranmore Schools. It should be remembered that children in Ripley are currently having to be sent to schools in Shearwater in Woking and even to Addlestone.

Surrey County Council has published no plans for creating further school places for children of all ages for the Horsleys, or for the traffic management and environmental improvement scheme they have promised between 2019 and 2023.

CPRE objects to the volume of high density new housing proposed for the Horsleys which amounts to some 35% more homes because it will harm the character, identity, and setting of these villages. NPPF requires that new residential development must respect these elements of the community environment which will be entirely lost by building on the scale envisaged and should be limited drastically to take account of the infrastructure deficit.

The heritage buildings at Hatchlands belonging to the National Trust, and at West Horsley Place, where the new proposal for the Grange "Opera in the Woods" has been approved by GBC, must be protected against what appears likely to be unsustainable development which will overwhelm the local community environment for ever. West and East Horsley will be swamped with extra cars and people using the shops, stations, village halls, sports facilities, medical services, parking space and public transport. Paragraph 87 of the NPPF makes clear that inappropriate developments by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. We do not agree with the draft Local Plan that this community should be a candidate for "insetting" to facilitate development on the scale suggested. We object to what is proposed and will oppose any suggestion that "exceptional circumstances" justify amending the Green Belt boundary in the way described at this draft Local Plan consultation as we consider this approach unsound. CPRE OBJECTIOCPRE

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

Attached documents:
boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, we consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I object to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2566  **Respondent:** 9098369 / Imogen Back  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

I write to you with regard to the Proposed Local Plan, as along our house and land at 20 The Street form part of the site which makes up A37,a plot allocated for development.

I am in full support of the plan and the inclusion of our site (20 The Street) as I believe it is critical to the continuance of West Horsley and its unique character that we have housing available to encourage new young people and families to this beautiful part of Surrey.

By building on infill sites such as ours rather than allocating large areas of open fields this can be achieved with minimal effect on the environment and outlook of the village. In fact the site that we form part of will not even be seen from the road.

My husband has had early conversations with some developers and I know that their ideas are considerate and in keeping.

I should also make clear that 20 The Street can be developed individually or as part of the whole plot, including road access either through our land or via Bell and Colvill.

My husband and I are in a position such that we could and would like to move plans forward quickly in consultation with the Council planning in accordance with the Local Plan.

Therefore, with specific reference to the National Planning Policy Framework, we are flexible as to whether the site falls within the 6-10 year timescale for the wider site development, or it can be developed on a smaller scale as either just 20 The Street within the shorter timescales of 0-5 years.

In conclusion I fully support the plan and the inclusion of our site and if I can be of any further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I ACCEPT that this brownfield site would be acceptable as a site for residential development (subject to application details).

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

Site A37 - Bell & Colvill

The only presently allocated site in the southern half of the village, there is a pedestrian walkway down The Street heading north into the heart of the village, but no dedicated cycle routes. The existing network of footpaths, etc immediately north of the site and east of The Street offer a good facility down to the railway bridge at the southern end of East Lane, thence there is a well-used public way across to East Horsley and the railway station. The northern half of West Horsley is not nearly so well served.

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

I am writing regarding the above, to strongly object to the following:

1. The removal of West & East Horsley villages from the green belt by insets The implication of which will completely change the character, balance and nature of these villages for ever, losing historic value and precious green belt. There is no ‘exceptional’ justification for building on this green belt.
1. The proposal of high density housing within West & East Horsley, is a staggering increase of over 35% more homes. However, there is no evidence of improved infrastructure. Already these villages combined have only one overcrowded medical centre, one over subscribed under 11's academy school and badly potholed roads. The inevitable increase in cars on the roads, will not only further damage the road surfaces and create traffic congestion, but parking for the shops and railway station will become a nightmare.

The drainage in the Horsley's is barely coping at the moment, and it is understood from Thames Water that further housing developments, will be unlikely to cope and the foul drainage system will need to be upgraded.

1. West Horsley appears to have a disproportionately high increase in housing (35%), compared to other locations eg: Ash & Tongham 16% and Guildford Town 11%. This coupled with the 2000 homes proposed on the former Wisley Airfield site, which has reappeared in The Guildford Plan, will have a totally unreasonable and unjust impact on the Horsley villages.

I urge you to please give my comments consideration, by keeping West & East Horsley villages within the green belt and not redefining the boundaries, to avoid unsuitable, unnecessary and unsustainable housing developments.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1868  Respondent: 10781729 / Sylvia Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I question the necessity for all these extra houses. I am not against the development of the Bell and Colville site A37 if the houses are small and affordable as this will tidy up the area. But there is no need for anything larger than a 3 bed semi detached house, there are plenty of larger houses for sale in the local Estate Agents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6828  Respondent: 10920129 / Steven Marshall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. I object to the scale of the building work being proposed for East Horsley – an increase of 36% - and to the fact that the four proposed sites are currently all within the Green Belt. I object because of the strain it would place on current infrastructure and because it would destroy the character of the village. The Council seems committed to pushing back settlement boundaries to provide more greenfield sites for new housing. In short, to destroying the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The Horsleys are ill equipped to cope with significant development as any rational analysis will quickly expose.

1. a) The road network

East and West Horsley can only be accessed on restricted roads

From the South

Ockham Road South is restricted so that a lorry and car cannot pass at Lynx Hill and the road remains narrow into the village.

The Street has limited access at the Bell and Colville roundabout and near Edwin road it is reduced to single file traffic.

From the North

Ockham Road North is a narrow country road which can’t take two lorries passing.

Old Lane is narrow, with a number of hazardous bends and a difficult junction into Cobham road.

From the West

The road from Cobham is the best route into Horsley but it is restricted at the railway bridge on Forest road. This road takes a lot of traffic as it is the access road from Horsley to supermarkets at Cobham.

From the East

A series of narrow roads provide access from Burntwood but none are capable of sustaining significantly increased traffic.

1. b) Retail Structure

The retail environment at Station Parade consists of 25 premises plus 3 at the bottom of Cobham Way, including a library, post office, chemist, 5 restaurant/cafes, butcher, baker and 2 mini supermarkets. The largest of these units are approximately 170-200 sq. m. There is no room for expansion of retail premises nor for the provision of extra parking places. This cannot be expanded or developed to a worthwhile retail centre. Bishopsmead, to the south of East Horsley is much smaller and similarly constrained. West Horsley has virtually no retail presence.

1. c) Infrastructure

There is already pressure on school places, doctors surgeries and parking. The Horsleys cannot sustain a significant increase in demand. In addition, there is limited space for expansion of any of these facilities.

1. d) The Geography of the Horsleys

The Horsleys lie just north of the A246 which runs to the north of the North Downs. Rainfall on this area flows north and causes periodic flooding in heavy rain. There are frequent problems with storm drains flooding in the Horsleys. Green belt land in and around the Horsleys is needed to absorb this water run off. Further building will exacerbate this problem.
SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

1. I OBJECT to the basis on which the housing requirements have been calculated. As they are not transparent they lack credibility.

1. I OBJECT to the final target housing number (based on a mathematical model which has not been disclosed) which is almost 70% higher than the official national estimates for population growth in the Borough.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1741  
Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  
Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37  

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

I Object to Policy A37.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/202  
Respondent: 15137921 / Jean Sylvester  
Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37  

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

The second site that would seem to be a reasonable possibility is A37, Bell and Colvill Garage. Currently this is a rather messy area and a well designed site could improve it. The proximity to local buses is an added advantage.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/297  
Respondent: 15150785 / Natasha Dillon  
Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37  

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

I have particularly strong objections to the Bell and Colvill proposed site - to fit 40 houses in such a small space seems impossible and will have a real impact on the surrounding area, traffic etc. We live at [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998].
almost opposite the garage and are wholly opposed to this development. I am also concerned about the deflationary impact on house prices.

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1472  Respondent: 15324993 / Susan Mills  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

I object to the Guildford Local Plan 2016 for the following reasons West Horsley should remain in the Green Belt.

An increase of 35% of housing would have a big impact on our village.

Our local State schools are already full and children would have to travel further to school which would then see an increase in traffic.

Parking at the station is at a premium during the week.

Most families now own two cars so with an increase of 35% housing we would see an increase of 70% in traffic. Our roads and pavements are already in a poor state.

Our roads would be gridlocked.

Thames Water have advised that the current waste water network in the area is unlikely to be able to support demand anticipated and would need upgrading.

The proposed increase would be totally out of character with our village which has many old buildings and a mix of different housing styles.

We live in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and it should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4150  Respondent: 15475041 / Anne Geary  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37

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

The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a
village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to us highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are

only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, we consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I object to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7793  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of Bell & Colville, WH – allocation A37

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7821  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A37
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49148</td>
<td>A37 - Land R/O Bell &amp; Colvill (horsley) Ltd, Epsom Road, West Horsley, Leatherhead, KT24 6DG</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Total records: 46.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7917  Respondent: 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

Sites Policies A37 to A41

Report page: 18

WHPC view: Objects strongly

In brief: All the West Horsley Sites are unsustainable, as demonstrated in the Planning Assessment Report (Appendix 2) when evaluated against NPPF Policies

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8275  Respondent: 8566497 / Derek Horne & Associates Ltd (Derek Horne)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

A38, Land to the west of West Horsley

This site is located outside of the Defined Boundaries of this Green Belt settlement in a location that is remote from shops and public transport. It is in a wholly unsustainable location.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4297  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

Site A38 and to the west of West Horsley

178. I object to this site being i Guildford Borough Council have proposed moving the settlement boundary and insetting the enlarged village in order to allow a development for which there are no exceptional circumstances.

179. Strangely, the "opportunities" include "Green Corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site" when the proposal represents a major reduction in these features.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/3281</td>
<td>8575617 / Effingham Parish Council (Ian Symes)</td>
<td>JB Planning Associates (John Boyd)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A39 East Horsley A38, A40, A41 West Horsley

Object

EPC objects to the over-development of our neighbouring parishes of East and West Horsley. These four proposed site selections will add approximately 445 housing units in what is presently Green Belt. We see this as overdevelopment of these two neighbouring villages. There is also the impression that land is being inset from the Green Belt for the sole purpose of meeting housing targets, and not for the reasons allowable for insetting set out in the NPPF. If development of these areas of land is permitted it will lead to the increasing erosion of the Green Belt between the Effingham/Bookham boundary and Guildford.

There are over 120 Effingham residents who live within the East Horsley settlement area and these residents will be particularly impacted by the increased traffic these site selections will generate. Many residents believe the narrow rural roads in the area are inadequate to support, safely, the construction traffic that will use these roads over many years.

A48 Traveller Site (Effingham)

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/8286</td>
<td>8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Partly within BOA TBL02 Clandon to Bookham Parkland; development should be scaled appropriate to environmental constraints and assist achievement of BOA objectives (inc. protection, restoration & creation of Priority habitats, inc. Mixed deciduous woodland, Hedgerows, Ponds).

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/7854</td>
<td>8599617 / Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd (Richard Kennedy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Attached documents:  □ Policy A38.pdf (444 KB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/895  **Respondent:** 8659489 / Helen Bennett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

As there needs to be some development this site seems to be more appropriate than some as it is already concealed behind the ribbon development. However the field facing long reach should be taken out of consideration as it provides the open green space that is so special for the villages.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/410  **Respondent:** 8659681 / Paul Roffey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

‘What are we going to do with West Horsley in the New Local Plan?’ asked John.

‘Well’ said Jack ‘the village has about 11/1200 houses and we propose to increase the size by 40 to 50% and build a further 500 to 600 houses’

‘Won’t that put a huge strain on all the services because I understand the area is close to gridlock in any case?’ said John ‘and what do the residents have to say about it?’

‘Almost without exception the residents are extremely upset but we have learnt to ignore the torrent of protests from the last plan and have produced a new plan that incorporates the same sites as our previous plan. As far as strain on services is concerned, I must admit that doctor’s surgeries are full, the local schools are all full, the railway station car park is full and has no potential for expansion, parking in the village is well nigh impossible at peak times, the narrow unlit lanes cannot possibly cope with more traffic and the road surfaces are appalling and always have been, the road junction to the A3 has dangerous levels of pollution let alone the congestion and of course we all know that the M25 at Junction 10 is a complete lottery but normally blocked’ said Jack.

‘I am no rocket scientist’ said John ‘but why on earth therefore are you intending to make matters so much worse?’

‘Well you see we have been forced by the Government to identify large swathes of land on which houses can be built in order to accommodate our burgeoning population and we feel we have no option.’
‘But isn’t Surrey already the most densely populated county in the whole of England with 683 people per sq.km. so who decides what quantity of extra housing is needed?’ enquired John.

‘That’s a moot point’ replied Jack ‘but we have conducted something called the SHMA and have come up with a figure but I must admit it is a touch subjective’

‘Surely however, since Brexit there is now an intention to control our borders and thereby reduce immigration and ergo the demand for housing. I note that the biggest losers on the stockmarket as soon as ‘Leave’ was confirmed were the housebuilders (down 30%) so I would imagine I am not alone in this contention. Will you be revising your SHMA downwards in light of this?’

‘Probably not. It’s gone too far.’

‘And what’s this I hear that you intend to build on protected Greenbelt land and in many cases before you have attempted to develop Brownfield sites?’ John demanded.

‘We have come up with what we think is a master stroke’ said Jack. ‘Brownfield sites are invariably more expensive to develop so Greenbelt sites are cheaper and less time consuming. In the case of West Horsley we have decided, subject to the Govt. Inspector agreeing with us, to remove the village from the Greenbelt so we can build anywhere and render any local protest impotent.

Incidentally we are proposing to try this ruse on approximately 15 equally pretty Greenbelt Surrey villages. It will make our lives so much easier’.

‘That’s verging on scandalous’ said John ‘so what is the point of involving the local residents in your ‘presentations’ if nothing can be altered?’

‘Transparency old boy’ said Jack ‘transparency.’

Further to the above I OBJECT to the proposal to build 135 houses at The Manor Farm site for the following reasons:-

1) My amenity will be severely blighted with the houses in the adjacent field to the north of my house having complete visual access over my garden and swimming pool.

2) The light will be reduced and the gorgeous sunsets will not be seen.

3) The road of Long Reach is a 4.6 metre wide lane with no pavements or lighting. I believe it is suggested that there should be an access to the site from Long Reach. It would be impossible for two construction lorries to pass each other and, as I have mentioned many times in the past, the road is reduced to a single lane because of a half mile queue of cars parked nose to tail with no passing places by those using the football club. I have sent many photos already of the mayhem caused. How fire engines/ambulances etc. could get through is beyond me. It is worth taking into account that the current single track lane to the site is used and was originally constructed solely for access to the Montesorri school and was only granted on the basis that the entrance gate is closed by 18.00 hrs every day. Any building work would be a real and significant hazard for the young children who go there.

4) The field in question is used every year as a car park for over 250 cars for the annual Horsley Football Club tournament (please see photo). The organisers have told me that the tournament, which has been running for over 25 years, will have to close if this field becomes unavailable as there is no viable parking alternative. I would have thought that GBC should be promoting sport and not reducing it.
5) If, heaven forbid, a housing estate gains approval it will have to cope with the floodlights already in place and also those that have recently been approved by GBC for the main pitch and of course the noise. Not ideal.

6) Councillor Paul Spooner of GBC has proudly trumpeted that only 1.6% of Greenbelt land in the Borough will be affected by the building proposals. This of course is massively misleading and is probably designed so to be. After all it makes good reading but a great proportion is A.O.N.B. which cannot be built on. At a rough estimate 25% of Horsley’s current Greenbelt land is being put up for building. Nobody was able, or willing, to answer my question on this point at last week’s presentation at East Horsley village hall.

7) I am non-plussed as to why West Horsley is being so disproportionately targeted. Perhaps it’s because it is the second closest village to London in the borough and developers will make more money here than elsewhere. How do you quantify an ‘affordable’ house in this area?

8) The plan is that all four of the sites adjacent or near to my house will now be developed simultaneously in years 0-5 (whereas the Manor Farm Site was originally proposed for years 6-10). Can you imagine what traffic carnage this would cause let alone dust, noise etc.. The developers (Thakeham Homes) have advised that because of the high water table at the Manor Farm site all the 135 houses will need to be piled which will probably drive us all bonkers.

9) A Department for Communities and Local Government spokesman said ‘Ministers have repeatedly been clear that demand for housing alone will not justify changing Green Belt boundaries’. (Daily Telegraph 25/4/16). What has empowered GBC to believe they are entitled to do otherwise. Surely a truly exceptional circumstance is required?? GBC call the removal from the Green Belt ‘insetting’ but the field next to my house which is set in beautiful quiet countryside is outside the curtilage of the village as has been declared in previous appeals by a Govt. Inspector.

10) Lastly, and most importantly, my wife and I feel we will have to abandon the house we have loved and nurtured for over 35 years. We could not stand the awful intrusion but our option to sell is already severely reduced because I doubt if anyone else could as well. A local Estate Agent reckons the house is already devalued by £300,000 because of the proposed development and that is if a buyer can be found which he says will now be difficult.

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

Attached documents:  DSC04220 2305843009213841397.JPG (6.5 MB)
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sites A37, A38, A40 and A41 are not practical for non-car based transport without alternative bus routes and improved pedestrian routes; this is further evidenced below.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/260  Respondent: 8708609 / Alistair Calder  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Nature Reserve at Manor Farm is inaccessible and tucked away at the back of it. Few even know of it and is mostly used by dog walkers that live nearby. That is not a Nature Reserve.

It is a small and unattractive piece of land deliberately created by the landowner to defeat the lack of SANG between Ripley and Effingham Commons. I object to its inclusion as SANG on the grounds that it is ineffective as a nature reserve, little used and with limited access.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7712  Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of Manor Farm, WH - allocation A38

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1207  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECT. Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Effect of the Proposals on West Horsley.

I believe that the plans would have a severely detrimental effect on the character of the village. Given the profits to be made by housing development within Surrey, once sites are designated for future development, that development will surely be brought forward quickly and to the maximum density permitted.

Specific comments are as follows:

- Several of the proposed development sites (particularly Manor Farm, ref A38/ID 15 and East Lane, ref A41/ID 2063) would have the effect of contributing to a merged settlement of East and West Horsley, when I believe that the open character of the countryside here should be protected by safeguarding the countryside along East Lane, Long Reach and Green Lane which continues to separate the two settlements and which contributes to the rural character of West Horsley. I understand that there is a proposal for the Raleigh School to develop a new site on the East Lane site, which again I object to for the same reason of impact on rural character.

- The suggested density of housing is totally out of character with the rest of West Horsley. Building to this increased density is particularly inappropriate in the peripheral locations which are planned for development.

- The proposed development sites are on the outer edge of the village and so would reasonably be expected to generate considerable additional traffic, as the development will be some distance from the station and the centre of the villages. Anyone who has spent any time in and around the village could tell you that the network of rural roads and lanes which surrounds the village simply do not have the capacity to serve this level of proposed additional development, and any extension of the road network would not only destroy the character of the village, but also the surrounding roads which would continue to pass through Green Belt land.

- I have strong concerns over the capacity of infrastructure such as drainage and sewerage.

- Localised flooding and poor surface water drainage is already a significant problem in the area. Since moving to the area I have witnessed first hand flooding along Ockham Road North, Green Lane and Ripley Lane. This has occurred on one or more occasions each winter in recent years and therefore is clearly not a "once in a decade" or "once in a lifetime" event. The fields planned for development must play a role at present in helping to drain this area, and additional development would both remove this drainage capacity and create additional issues of surface drainage.

- Additional development of any significant scale will cause significant strain on the village school and doctors surgery (the later located in East Horsley), which are running close to capacity. Adding extra capacity to these services cannot easily be resolved, even if possible through entirely developer funded schemes, without fundamentally altering the geographic make-up of the villages there is little or no land in the core of the village to accommodate any additional services. Developing these facilities on the periphery of the village (which as noted above is now proposed for a potential extension of the Raleigh School) would once again fundamentally alter its character and position in its rural context.

- East and West Horsley are thriving villages, which do not need artificial support through rapid expansion of population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Views of the Local Community in West Horsley.

The strength of feeling throughout the village against the proposed relaxation of the planning guidance is considerable. This opposition is shared by all of the local residents that I have spoken to, as well as by the West Horsley Parish Council.

I believe that the views of those who have chosen to make their homes within the community should be paramount when making decisions which will have such a radical and irreversible impact on the village.

Indeed my view is supported by recent planning guidance which supports greater involvement of local communities in the planning process. If localism is to mean anything, Guildford Borough Council should be listening to the views of the local community whose lives and well being would be so adversely affected by the plans.

Removing East and West Horsley from the Green Belt and encouraging additional development on such a scale would exclude and ignore the strong feelings of the local community.

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

Attached documents:

---

I wish to comment on this site, but please note my comments also apply to Sites A37, A39, A40 and A41.

These sites are all Green Belt sites and their development will cause great harm to the Green Belt. There are no special circumstances that outweigh the harm that will be done to the green belt. Thus this policy is not lawful.
This is covered in more detail in the attachment.

the development of this site (and A39, A40 and A41) will cause the merger of the villages of East Horsley and West Horsley. This is clearly the councils intention, as it seeks to inset these villages from the Green Belt, with a total of 363 ha (3.6 square kilometres) to be removed from the Green belt, with little regard given to the quality of the new proposed Green belt boundaries. These large housing developments will submerge the pattern of development in these villages as the housing density is much higher than housing already present, and the style will be little boxes, so loved by developers. The NPPF specifically states that one of the purposes of the Green Belt is to stop the merger of towns - but in fact this is a deliberate policy of GBC. There is a recognition of the need to prevent towns from merging, as this draft local plan includes a proposal to create new Green Belt around Ash Green village, to prevent it merging with Ash and Tongham. It is a remarkable contradiction that on the hand GBC seek to promote the merger of neighbouring villages, but on the other hand seek to prevent. In one case the policy to ensure the merger happens is to remove the villages from the green belt, with the addition of large numbers of new dwellings, but on the other hand, to create new green belt to halt housing development to prevent Ash Green village from merging with its neighbours. These different proposals are in the same plan - and the contradiction in them seems lost on the architects of the local plan.

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

Attached documents:  Site objection.pdf (617 KB)
Site A38: Manor Farm, West Horsley: (135 houses)

This is the largest of the six sites proposed in the Horsleys and as such would provide 135 additional houses, 300-400 people and in excess of 300 cars. This proposed development would incorporate the Grade II listed Manor Farm House and fall within a designated green corridor with a nature reserve. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built. For the above reasons, I OBJECT to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

I am a resident of West Horsley, have lived in this village for 18 years and want to strongly object to the potential removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt leading to the insetting and extending of the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries, in particular with regard to the proposed development site at Manor Farm.

With the potential of 135 new homes to be built on the Manor Farm site, and given that the majority of households on average have 2 + cars and 4 family members the pressure this will create on already under resourced facilities such as schools, the road network, drainage, medical services and local parking and train services is unsustainable. Whilst I understand there is increasing pressure on local housing, I feel there are better sites that do not impinge on the Green Belt.

I believe an increase in housing at Manor will fundamentally not work and irrevocably change the balance in the village to a completely unsupportable and unsustainable level.

I OBJECT to the proposal for Manor Farm laid out in the Local Plan

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

Attached documents:

1. Policy A38 (West Horsley) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
## 2. Extension of Settlement Area of West Horsley

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

### Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8253</th>
<th>Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to policy A38</td>
<td>There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/998</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1461</th>
<th>Respondent: 8850433 / Ian Doherty</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.
The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to me highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first ‘lines of defence’ against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I OBJECT to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5889  Respondent: 8883137 / Barbara Lewis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am a resident of West Horsley, having lived in this village for 5 years, I am strongly objecting to the potential removal of West Horsley from the Green Belt, leading to the insetting and extending of the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries, in particular with regard to the proposed development site at Manor Farm.

Whilst I understand there is increased pressure on local housing, I feel that there are better sites that do not impinge on the Green Belt. The potential of 135 new homes (given that the majority of households on average have 2 + cars and 4 family members) to be built on the Manor Farm site, will only increase the pressure where the facilities, such as schools, the road network, drainage, medical services and local parking are already under resourced.

I believe an increase in housing at Manor Farm will fundamentally not work and irrevocably change the balance in the village to a completely unsupportable and unsustainable level.

I OBJECT to the proposal for Manor Farm laid out in the Local Plan

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4722  Respondent: 8887873 / S E Lea  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Development Site referenced Policy A38

In particular, I object to the proposal for the building of 135 homes on land to the west of West Horsley, (Referenced Policy A38, land at Manor Farm). The majority of land on this site is classified as moderate to good agricultural land and is currently in use as pasture for grazing horses and houses a livery stable. I question the need to remove such agricultural land from the Green Belt. Surely it is important to preserve agricultural land for future generations. This site makes a significant contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework of March 2012 requires planners to "recognise the character and beauty of the countryside and take into account all the benefits of the best and most versatile farmland".

In addition, the site is a haven for wild life, frequented by deer, foxes, small mammals, reptiles, bats and a large variety of birdlife.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4079  Respondent: 8887873 / S E Lea  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Since the consultation in 2016, only one proposed development site in West Horsley (Site A 41) has been removed from the Local Plan, leaving four sites, A37, A38, A39 and A 40. This means that the eastern side of the Borough is scheduled to take a greater proportion of new homes within the Green Belt. This is land which is closest to London, green belt land which is most needed to prevent the encroachment of the Metropolitan conurbation. With particular reference to site A38, land to the west of West Horsley (land at Manor Farm) where it is proposed to build 135 homes, the majority of the land on this site is classified as moderate to good agricultural land and is currently in use as pasture for grazing horses and houses a livery stable. I question the need to remove such agricultural land from the Green Belt. Surely it is important to preserve agricultural land for future generations. This site makes a significant contribution to the openness of the Green Belt surrounding the village. The National Planning Policy Framework of March 2012 requires planners to “recognise the character and beauty of the countryside and take into account all the benefits of the best and most versatile farmland”. The Guildford Local Plan 2017 must recognise this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1508  Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is the largest of the six sites proposed in the Horsleys and as such would provide 135 additional houses, 300-400 people and in excess of 300 cars. This proposed development would incorporate the Grade II listed Manor Farm House and fall within a designated green corridor with a nature reserve. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more
than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built. For the above reasons, I **OBJECT** to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7452</th>
<th>Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Site A38: Manor Farm, West Horsley: (135 houses)**

This is the largest of the six sites proposed in the Horsleys and as such would provide 135 additional houses, 300-400 people and in excess of 300 cars. This proposed development would incorporate the Grade II listed Manor Farm House and fall within a designated green corridor with a nature reserve. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for the expansion of either. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. These are problems NOW before any additional houses are built. For the above reasons, I **OBJECT** to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7783</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object to the allocation of Manor Farm, WH - allocation

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4320</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Site A38 - Land to the west of West Horsley**

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.
There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7216  **Respondent:** 8948385 / Gillian Eve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5277  **Respondent:** 9335041 / David Reeve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

Policy A38: Land at Manor Farm, West Horsley

I OBJECT on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2622  **Respondent:** 9412065 / Stephen Bray  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

Site A38 - Manor Farm:

This site is located in the north half of the village, linking with Long Reach to the west and East Lane to the south - however, Long Reach presently has no pedestrian walkway , and neither road has a dedicated cycle way.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/768  Respondent: 10662337 / Christopher Hadley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

I would like to Object to policy P2. On the grounds that:

Impact on traffic, and infrastructure, seems to have been ignored. Impact on water catchment and flood plains ignored.

Brexit has introduced new market conditions which have to be analysed.

Impact on local agriculture seems to have been ignored.

Balance of housing requirement for Guildford is disproportionate to the remainder of Surrey.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4395  Respondent: 10873377 / Rebecca Howard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

As a resident of West Horsley you will not be surprised to learn that I vehemently object to the Plan's proposals for building more than 2500 new homes in this vicinity. It is Green Belt land and should remain so. There is no justification for development on this scale in this area, and there are certainly no "exceptional circumstances" to allow the Council to build on the Green Belt here.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1742  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

I Object to Policy A38.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

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

I object most strongly to your proposal to build 135 houses at the so-called Manor Farm Site. We already have high density housing in Long Reach, not only on the road itself but also in the two original council housing cul-de-sacs namely Woodside and Farley's Close. An aerial view of the site would suggest that it could fit in like a piece in a jigsaw. However, there is a noticeable exception and that is the northern boundary which does not follow the line and is indisputably outside the natural envelope of the village. The field contained therein should not be included in the plan and it seems to have been tacked on to make the site more appealing by having possibly two access points. The fact that the road Long Reach is completely unsuitable as an artery seems to have escaped the attention of the planners. I genuinely feel that it's a possibility that no member of the planning committee has ever visited it, certainly not at a weekend!

To attempt to shoe-horn in further cheek-by-jowl housing would create a volume with which the village simply couldn't cope. It's not just the schools, doctors' surgeries, roads, trains, station car parks etc. being ridiculously over-subscribed, it's more than that. The seemingly vindictive attempt to blight West Horsley with this site and all the others would reduce this village to a congested dormitory and change it's character forever whilst the developers can walk away with full wallets leaving the residents to pick up the pieces.

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

Attached documents:

Representations on the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites, June 2016
Representations by Thakeham Homes Ltd
Site: Land to the west of West Horsley – Policy A38

Vail Williams have been appointed by Thakeham Homes Ltd to make representations on Guildford Borough Council Regulation 19 Submission Local Plan, June 2016.

These representations focus on Policy A38: Land to the west of West Horsley. The proposed allocation of this site is for residential use (C3) and this is fully supported.

National Policy & Strategic Policies

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out in paragraph 14, and this “golden thread” runs through both plan making and decision taking. For plan making Paragraph 14 states that:

“Local Planning Authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area” and “local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change ....”

The second part of paragraph 14 states that, for decision taking, this means:

“Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay ....”
The requirement to deliver sustainable economic development, including homes, businesses and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places is further highlighted in Paragraph 17 of the NPPF (Point 3). It is clear there is a significant thrust at national level ‘to boost significantly the supply of housing’ (NPPF para 47.)

The Local Plan policies contained within the GBLP submission document, need to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The plan must demonstrate that it is positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

**Policy S1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development**

Policy S1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) within the Submission Plan for Guildford Borough Council reflects the requirement of the NPPF and it is welcomed that the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is also supported that the Council will work proactively with applicants, jointly to find solutions that mean proposals can be approved wherever possible. This is a positive strategic policy within the Local Plan, reflecting national guidance, and it is noted in paragraph 4.1.1 beneath Policy S1 that “Local plans must plan positively to seek opportunities that meet the areas’ objectively assessed development needs and be flexible enough to adapt to rapid change”. Given the plan period of 20 years, the requirement for flexibility within planning policy to respond to changes over a long period is important and should be engrained throughout the plan.

**Policy S2: Borough wide strategy**

Policy S2 (Borough wide strategy) confirms that the Council will make provision for 13,860 new homes over the plan period (2013/2033). These figures represent the latest evidence gathered through the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) September 2015. The policy also continues and identifies other requirements for different use classes; including employment floor space.

Along with the overall housing number, Policy S2 contains a table setting out the indicative annual housing split and this runs from the year 2018/19 to 2032/33. The figures contained within the table increase towards the latter part of the Plan period and the policy states this is “reflective of timescales associated with the delivery of strategic sites and infrastructure.”

The total housing numbers identified within the table total 10,395. This is obviously short of the requirement for 13,860; as identified in the opening sentence of Policy S2. However, it is noted that the indicative annual housing targets start in the year 2018, whereas the Plan period runs from 2013. It is considered this is misleading and the table should cover the whole Plan period, including actual completions in the years preceding adoption. This would provide a clearer indicative annual approach demonstrating how the Council are going to deliver the overall housing requirement for the Plan period. This should also incorporate the required flexibility within the housing figures, to ensure that the overall target is met and sufficient flexibility is built into the plan, as required by the NPPF.

As already mentioned the NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development and flexibility, it is therefore suggested that within the first sentence of Policy S2 that the words “at least” are inserted in relation to the 13,860 new homes. The figure contained within Policy S2 should not be absolute and any further proposals that are sustainable and in accordance with the NPPF and the development plan, should be approved without delay.

**Proposed wording for Policy S2: Borough wide strategy**

“During the plan period (2013-33), we will make provision for at least 13,860 new homes…”

This proposed wording will also facilitate the Duty to Cooperate, allowing the flexibility to contribute to the wider unmet need within the Housing Market Area.

**Policy H1: Homes for all**
Policy H1 (Homes for all) provides guidance on housing mix and density, along with specialist housing. The Policy is supported in terms of its aim to deliver a wide choice of homes to meet a range of accommodation needs and that development should provide a suitable mix of housing. It is considered important that site specific characteristics are taken into account and this is identified within both the housing mix section and the density section of Policy H1.

With regard to density, the Policy states that “new residential development is required to make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character, context and distinctiveness. Residential densities will vary dependent upon the local area, context and character and the sustainability of the location”. This ability to respond through detailed design to local circumstances is supported as it offers flexibility within the planning and design process.

The Local Plan states that it will consist of two parts, with the current document setting out the vision, aims and strategy for the Borough up to 2033 and the second part (Local Plan: Development Management Policies) containing detailed development control policies. This will provide the Council the opportunity to expand upon the key areas identified within Policy H1 in relation to local character, context, distinctiveness and site characteristics.

For the site Land to the west of West Horsley (Policy A38) this provides the flexibility to deliver at least the number of homes (135) identified, with the potential to respond to local character and ‘make the most efficient use of land’ through the detailed design and application stage.

**Policy H2: Affordable Homes**

National policy seeks to ensure the delivery of “a wide choice” of homes and to “widen opportunities for home ownership” through the creation of “sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities” (NPPF paragraph 50). Along with Policy H1, which contains details on housing mix, Policy H2 (Affordable homes) seeks to provide “sufficient housing to meet the needs of the borough’s population will ensure that the borough thrives, with mixed, balanced communities” (GBC LP 4.2.33).

Whilst a suitable mix of housing is required and supported through national policy, there is still the overriding requirement to “to boost significantly the supply of housing” (NPPF paragraph 47). Any housing policy, including and specifically in relation to affordable housing, needs to ensure effective delivery over the Plan period and also be flexible enough to respond to changing circumstances.

The delivery of housing, especially affordable housing, continues to dramatically alter with various new proposals seeking to increase the delivery of overall housing numbers. A wide range of housing products are available including: starter homes, shared ownership, shared equity, discount market rent, rent to buy, along with market housing and affordable and social rent.

Given the wide range of housing products available and the constantly shifting economic circumstances, it is considered that Policy H2 needs to be flexible and not overly prescriptive to ensure constant housing delivery over the Plan period.

Policy H2 also, in the first bullet point, states that “affordable homes will be provided: on sites providing five or more homes…” The thresholds, for affordable housing, have been regularly challenged and reviewed recently and the proposed policy is, as currently worded, contradictory to national policy including:

Paragraph: 017 Reference ID: 23b-017-20160519, which states: “Are there any exceptions to the 10-unit threshold? Local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less to development in designated rural areas…”. This follows the Court of Appeal decision (May 2016) where the Department for Communities and Local Government won its appeal over a ruling that planning policy for affordable housing requirements on small-scale developments was unlawful.

Proposed wording for Policy H2: Affordable housing

Along with ensuring the threshold reflects the latest legal and national policy situation, we propose the following amendments to ensure adequate flexibility and continuous delivery over the plan period:
“...The tenure and size of affordable homes provided on each qualifying site must contribute, to the Council’s satisfaction, towards meeting the mix of affordable housing needs reflecting local demand and having regard to identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2015, or subsequent affordable housing needs evidence. This currently includes a tenure split of at least 70% rented, with the remainder being other forms of affordable housing. Affordable rent must be no more than the maximum level set out in our most recent housing guidance or strategy. Developers will be...”

It is also proposed that the following should be added to the policy to ensure deliverability:

“Proposals that are unable to meet affordable housing requirements will be supported by clear viability evidence to establish deliverability.”

**Green Belt and Countryside Study**

For Policy A38 (Land to the west of West Horsley), the Green Belt and Countryside Study identifies the area (C14) as low sensitivity. The actual site is referenced as C14-C and it concludes that it is a “Potential Development Area (PDA) surrounding villages”. For site A38, it is agreed that the site is suitable for residential development and it should be inset from the Green Belt.

**Land to the west of West Horsley: Land Availability Assessment**

The site is identified within the Land Availability Assessment (LAA) site reference 15. The LAA identifies the site to be “located between Bens Wood Nature Reserve (non-statutory) to the north, Northcote Road to the east, East Lane to the south, and Long Reach to the west”. It terms of site character the LAA concludes “the site is physically and visually enclosed by a local undulation, hedgerows and existing residential development”. The site is adjacent to existing roads and vehicular access can be provided.

The LAA identifies that there is a Grade II listed building on site (Manor Farm House), which will need to be preserved as part of any new development. This requirement is recognised and endorsed.

The proposed development will require the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and bespoke SANG will be provided (as detailed below).

It is confirmed that the site and the proposed SANG is under the control of Thakeham Homes Ltd and is immediately available and achievable for residential development. The site is capable of providing at least the 135 residential units (C3) as proposed in the allocation Policy A38.

Attached as part of these representations is a Concept Plan (BMD 14.023.DR.001A) that demonstrates the site is capable of achieving a high quality layout, respecting the listed building and character of the surrounding area, whilst delivering the housing units required in Policy A38. The site boundary includes the bespoke SANG provision to the north and illustrates the proposed access roads from both Long Reach road and East Lane. The overarching conclusions of the LAA assessment, for this site, are supported.

**Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**

As mentioned above, the site is required to provide SANG and details are contained with the IDP 2016. Specifically for Land at Manor Farm East Lane, West Horsley, (Policy A38), paragraph 4.23 states that: “we expect the developers of the following sites to deliver bespoke SANGs to mitigate their own developments... Land at Manor Farm East Lane...”

The attached Concept Plan (BMD 14.023.DR.001A), encompasses the whole site including the provision of SANG as required by policy and detailed in the IDP. Thakeham Homes confirm that the site is available and deliverable for residential (C3) development including the provision of bespoke SANG as detailed on the attached Concept Plan.
Policy A38: Land to the west of West Horsley

Having considered the National and Strategic Policies requiring housing development, the proposed allocation A28 identifies requirements (including the listed building and SANG) and opportunities (green corridors and links to the SANG) for the site. The attached Concept Plan (BMD 14.023.DR.001A) demonstrates the site is capable of accommodating at least 135 residential units whilst respecting local heritage and providing, including links to, the bespoke SANG provision to the north.

In conclusion, the site is available for development, is being actively promoted by Thakeham Homes, and there are no overriding site constraints. The attached Concept Plan demonstrates that detailed design is able to respond to site specific characteristics and also provide bespoke SANG. There are no overarching policy or site specific reasons why the site should not be allocated for residential (C3) use in accordance with Policy A38.

The site is available, achievable, and deliverable within the short term and will enable the delivery of much needed housing within the early part of the plan period. The proposed allocation, through Policy A38, of the land to the west of West Horsley, is fully supported.

Summary and Conclusion

The site (A38) is available and suitable for residential development of at least the 135 (C3) units identified in policy. There is single developer interest, Thakeham Homes, so the site can be quickly progressed and deliver much needed homes early in the plan period. There are no significant infrastructure requirements that would preclude development and the provision of bespoke SANG is achievable; as demonstrated on the attached Concept Plan.

The proposed allocation of Land to the west of West Horsley (Policy A38) is fully supported. It is in the ownership of two supportive landowners who wish to work jointly with Thakeham Homes to provide at least 135 residential units, contributing to the housing requirement early in the plan period.

Examination

Given the importance placed on housing delivery at a national level and within the Guildford Local Plan, and the comments within this representation, we wish to express our desire to appear at examination and attend any pre-examination meetings.

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

Attached documents:
- West Horsley BMD.14.023.DR.001A Concept Plan.pdf (365 KB)
- Reps Guildford LP Manor Farm West Horsley July 2016.pdf (398 KB)
1.2 As advised by the Council, these representations will comment only on changes made to the 2016 version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan. They should therefore be read alongside and in conjunction with representations made by Dandara Ltd to the 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan dated June 2016 and included alongside these additional representations for completeness.

1.3 Dandara Ltd are promoting land located to the west of Shere Road, south of the A246 Epsom Road and east of Wix Hill in West Horsley for residential development. A full description of the site is included in Section 3.0 of our original 2016 representations with a red line site location plan reproduced in Figure 1 below:

[Figure 1: Site Location Plan]

1.4 The majority of the site was identified as a Potential Development Area (PDA) within the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) under site reference E4-B and provided with an indicative capacity of 56 new homes. The site was also included within the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment 2016 (LAA) and provided with site ID 2175 ‘land to the south of West Horsley, Shere Road’ (n.b. error in our original 2016 representations giving LAA site ID of 2025). A full assessment of the GBCS and the identification of land to the west of Shere Road as a PDA was included in Section 4.0 of our original 2016 representations. Figure 2 overleaf refers:

[Figure 2: PDAs in West Horsley (South)]

1.5 These further representations will focus on specific changes made to the original 2016 Proposed Submission Local Plan as well as the supporting updated evidence base which includes:
- West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Guildford Addendum Report 2017;
- Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2017 Addendum;
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2017;
- Topic Paper: Housing Delivery 2017;
- Topic Paper: Duty to Cooperate 2017;

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/865  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A38 land to west of West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/866  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A38 land to west of West Horsley.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1476  **Respondent:** 15325409 / Charles Mills  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

I wish to object to the contents of the Guildford local plan for the following reasons: We already have a crowded village with many facilities under heavy strain:

The Raleigh school is already full with no room for expansion and other schools are full to capacity.

Car parks at the station and in the village are heavily used.

Thames water have advised that the current waste water network in the area is unlikely to be able to support demand anticipated and would need upgrading.

East and West Horsley will be swamped with extra cars and people using shops, station, village halls sports and other facilities.

Medical facilities would be put under strain.

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

Attended documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3269  **Respondent:** 15443489 / Andrew Cook  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

New Local Plan (2016)

It would appear that Guildford Council have not listened to the comments previously made by many people criticising the 2014 draft local plan and have swept all these comments under the carpet as if they did not exist. They have now proceeded with the new GBC local plan as if nothing had happened.

Any new developments should be in keeping with the character of the two villages and within the present existing boundaries of East and West Horsley.
By moving the village boundaries - a very sneaky way of land grabbing, will in no way enhance the character of the existing villages. The infrastructure in the area is already struggling and would be unable to cope with the volume of traffic which would be increased by the proposed Local Plan Strategy.

The local infrastructure will need to be improved to meet the present needs of an expanding population as a result of any new developments.

With the proposal of over 500 houses in East and West Horsley, with the majority in West Horsley, there have been no proposals for a new primary school in the area despite the fact the Raleigh School cannot now cope with current demand for school places.

Also no thought seems to have been given that infrastructures such as health - no commitment for a new doctor’s surgery, education, transport. The roads around the Horsleys are already at breaking point.

If the proposal for over 2,000 houses at the Wisley development proceeds the roads around the Horsley's would certainly be unable to cope with all the additional traffic.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4164</th>
<th>Respondent: 15475649 / Joanne Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A38 is particularly due to close proximity to special woodlands including high water table, narrow roads and sheer number of houses proposed for such a small area is not feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5929</th>
<th>Respondent: 15578881 / Robert Leishman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been a resident of West Horsley, a wonderful village, for the past 18 years and am totally opposed to the villages potential removal from the Green Belt, then “insetting” and extending the 2003 Local Plan Settlement Area boundaries, in particular with regard to the Proposed development site at Manor Farm. With the potential of 135 new homes to be built on the Manor Farm site, and given that the majority of households these days have 2 or more cars, ( and increase of 270 cars &amp; journeys on the road each day )I and most residents believe this would create an unsupportable issue for :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local traffic and local journey times for schools, shopping and the journey to the station would become greatly increased and unsustainable for commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parking in the village and at the station
Medical Services
An increased danger to cyclists and pedestrians

I believe an increase in housing at Manor Farm (let alone any of the other sites in the plan) will fundamentally not work, and irrevocable change the balance in the village to a completely unsupportable and unsustainable level.

**I OBJECT to the proposal for Manor Farm laid out in the Local Plan.**

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7765  Respondent: 15672737 / Andrew Mills  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

I object to the proposed building sites for Manor Farm, West Horsley. The current village infrastructure and road system is already under strain from individual building projects. The traffic alone from these proposed new sites will be extremely damaging to the village environment, the safety of the residents and existing dwellings along the routes that will be used by building plant traffic.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7822  Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A38

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

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed development exceeds the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the fact that no changes have been made to the proposals to inset East and West Horsley from the Green Belt since the 2016 Consultation.

I object to the proposal to move the boundary of East Horsley’s area of residential settlement south of the A246. This proposal has not been justified and appears arbitrary. This area abuts the Surrey Hills AONB and raises the prospect of inappropriate development in this sensitive area.

I object to the fact that though new paragraph 2.10b places emphasis on the need for adequate infrastructure to be in place this has not been applied to East or West Horsley. Though the dropping of sites A36 and A41 is welcome, the proposals still mean an extra 255 new hoses for West Horsley, an increase of some 25%. There are no proposals for any improvements or additions to an infrastructure which is already stretched with waiting lists at all levels for the local primary school, substantial waiting times for appointments at the local medical centre and parking at Horsley railway station at its limit on normal working days. I therefore object to the proposals for sites A37, A38, A39 and A40.

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

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

2.1 The schedule of sites at page 143 of the Submission Local Plan indicates a change to the quantum of development proposed although the allocation remains at ‘approximately 135 homes’ as worded.

2.2 Objection is made regarding the overall quantum of development proposed within the local plan (as noted within the housing section above) and given the overall change we believe the quantum of housing suggested within Policy A38 could be augmented further by adding ‘for a minimum of 135 homes…’.

2.3 This would reflect Criterion m) of Policy D4 reflecting the need to make most effective use of available land; it would contribute towards the overall shortfall in supply indicated in the first five years of the Plan; it would contribute towards reinstating the Boroughs objectively assessed housing need to that required through the 2015 SHMA; and it would contribute towards the Borough’s Duty to Cooperate with its neighbouring authorities in meeting the otherwise unmet needs across the HMA.

2.4 The approach to remove ‘maximum or an approximate number’ and provide certainty as a ‘minimum’ has been highlighted through discussions at the Waverley Examination at the end of June 2017 (as Counsel for Guildford Borough Council would confirm). Further, the policy as currently drafted implies a cap on the quantum of development considered acceptable and in this respect does not comply with the spirit of the NPPF which seeks to promote housing growth. Indeed one of the Core Planning Principles at paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that planning should:

‘Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.’

2.5 Therefore a revision to the drafting to either ‘for a minimum’ or ‘at least’ 135 homes is suggested.

2.6 We Object to the amended to the allocation which states “…including some self-build and custom house building plots”. The Government has indicated a commitment to self-build and custom house building plots but have not yet issued policy in relation to the initiative. Government guidance at the time of determining a planning application would be a material consideration that will be looked at as part of the planning balance. We therefore object to the inclusion of this clause as this stage as being premature and pre-empting confirmation of the Government’s future policy.

2.7 Under the ‘Key Considerations’ section of Policy A38, the considerations section should be positively worded to ‘design out’ those aspects through good planning and design. We also recommend the inclusion at point (4) to the specific SANG – ‘SANG9 (Bespoke Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) Bens Wood, West Horsley.’

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

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

Document part: A39 - Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/228  **Respondent:** 8555489 / Alan Norris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

**Site A39 - Land near Horsley Railway Station**

Part of this land nearest to the main road through East Horsley should be reserved for additional car parking for Horsley station users. This land is within a short walk of Horsley station. Demand for car parking at Horsley station could exceed the capacity of current station car park, particularly as this station could be the preferred station by commuters from the proposed Wisley airfield development.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7920  **Respondent:** 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

**Sites Policies A37 to A41**

**Report page:** 18

**WHPC view:** Objects strongly

**In brief:** All the West Horsley Sites are unsustainable, as demonstrated in the Planning Assessment Report (Appendix 2) when evaluated against NPPF Policies

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4298  **Respondent:** 8573793 / Harry Eve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

**Site A39 Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, West Horsley**

**180. I object** to this site being included. It is a greenfield site in the Green Belt and Guildford Borough Council have proposed moving the settlement boundary and insetting the enlarged village in order to allow a development for which there are no exceptional circumstances.
181. This development is likely to add significantly to existing flooding issues and puts housing next to Lollesworth Wood which will impact adversely on its biodiversity.

182. Access is proposed next to the railway bridge at a point where the narrow pavement is heavily used by children walking to and from the nearby schools. Traffic is also particularly heavy in this vicinity at school run times.

183. Strangely, the "opportunities" include "Green Corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site" when the proposal represents a major reduction in these features.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8287  Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Within BOA TBL02 Clandon to Bookham Parkland; development should be scaled appropriate to environmental constraints and assist achievement of BOA objectives (see A38 above). Lollesworth Wood SNCI/Ancient woodland is adjacent and the Trust reserves further representation if this tension cannot be satisfactorily reconciled.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/902  Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

This area of land is largely hidden from view and consequently is less damaging visually. However, this is a very large piece of open field in the green belt. A more limited, high density form of starter homes etc would be appropriate her which used up lessor the undeveloped lend.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7715  Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

- I object to the allocation of land at Ockham Road North, Eh – allocation A39

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

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

Attached documents:

Environmental Impact of Proposed Housing in Horsley: Flood Risk

Building the large numbers of houses proposed in the Draft Local Plan will significantly increase the risk of flooding. I strongly object to the proposal in the Draft Local Plan for housing development in Ockham Road North, adjacent to Horsley station. This housing would be located in a floodplain. Housing on this site will adversely affect local drainage patterns, having a knock on effect further down the drainage basin. Increase in the volume of run-off due to paving over of arable land, coupled with higher incidence of flash-flooding caused by Global warming, will result in a greater frequency of abnormal fluvial discharge events, beyond the capacity of the existing drainage system. This will increase the likelihood of homes in the vicinity being flooded.

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

Attached documents:

5.3. Policy A39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station. Proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 hectare site that is well hidden behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge. This site will provide a good location for housing including affordable homes as it is centrally located in the village close to shops and railway station. The site is partly in flood zone 3 and would restrict numbers of units built. Because of its central location it could provide some employment opportunities in the form of offices and as an extension to the station car park.

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

Attached documents:
Respondent: 8795553 / Robert Taylor  Agent:

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

**Policy A39:** Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station. I OBJECT to this policy. The movement in Green Belt boundaries needed to bring this site within the Settlement Area is not valid. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify it, the boundary move proposed is to shift from a 'main river line' to the edge of a piece of woodland - effectively moving from a strong defensive barrier to a weaker one. The proposed policy also involves the loss of prime agricultural land. Moreover, around 30% of this site is designated as Flood Zone 3. Accordingly, this move is not supportable and this site should be dropped as a policy from the Local Plan.

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

Attached documents:

---

Respondent: 8796609 / Rupert Pye  Agent:

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

**POLICY A39, located in East Horsley**

This site is for 100 dwellings and has been added since the 2014 local plan. This site is unsuitable for this number of houses as it will have very limited access onto Ockham Road South which is right up against the northern side of a railway bridge with a busy vet and a restaurant on the southern side.

The site is also prone to flooding in certain areas.

In addition, as a result of the additional dwellings, the local infrastructure will be unable to cope; in particular:

- The local schools, both primary and secondary, are already completely full and would not be able to take additional children. This matter is not addressed in the local plan.

- Public transport is currently inadequate with poor bus services and station car parks that are already full.

- Local roads are also unfit for purpose being very busy and in poor condition.

- The nearest medical centre, in East Horsley, is totally overstretched with appointments being difficult to obtain.

- There are only a couple of small shops in West Horsley with most residents doing their shopping in East Horsley village. Traffic and parking in East Horsley Village is already too great for the facilities.

For the above reasons I OBJECT to the above-named Policy.

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

Attached documents:

---

Respondent: 8796705 / Mandy Pye  Agent:

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

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

This proposed development wasn't included in the Local Plan in 2014 but now the field which is in the Green Belt is being proposed as the site for the building of 100 houses with the entrance to the new development being by the railway bridge in East Horsley. The impact of Policy A39 on the surrounding area would be unsuitable because,

- the access to this site is next to a railway bridge and an area of road very prone to flooding
- the access is also next to a vet and a restaurant all of which have cars coming and going on to an already busy road
- the access to and from the site is close to the steps down from the station and is where many people cross when returning home
- the area is within the Green Belt
- the surrounding area's infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the additional 100 houses
- the roads are unfit for purpose being narrow and poorly maintained with many local roads having no paths
- the local Medical Centre in East Horsley is already overstretched with difficulties obtaining appointments at present
- the schools in the local area are already over subscribed so would not have the capacity to admit new pupils
- the public transport in the area is inadequate

For these reasons I OBJECT strongly to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1620  Respondent: 8805249 / Peter Warburton  Agent:

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

Although small changes have been made to Site Policy A39, these are not material and GBC is still proposing to include this Green Belt site within the revised Local Plan.

In particular the change in the inset boundary proposed in the Pegasus Green Belt & Countryside Study for this site has no merit whatsoever. This study proposes the movement of the settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood, thereby removing over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present Green Belt boundary line is defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘river line’. As such, this river line represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Therefore, I believe the justification for moving this boundary under current Green Belt rules is unsound.

The site also has other serious deficiencies for development with nearly a third of the land being classified as Flood Zone 3. The site is also directly adjacent to an important SNCI, as GBC’s revised policy has now belatedly recognised.

I OBJECTS to Site Policy A39, land near Horsley railway station
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2184  **Respondent:** 8820417 / Simon Marshall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39

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

On Policy A39 arbitrary wording has been added to include self-building or custom building plots within the allocation of 100 dwellings in order to make the policy compliant with national legislation as opposed to what is appropriate for the site. The allocation of 100 dwellings on this site contravenes Policy D4 which inter alia states that:

"Ensure appropriate density to make the most efficient use of the land whilst responding to local character and context".

100 houses on a 5.7ha site does not respond to local character and context given the nature of the immediately surrounding houses and the general established density of development in the village of East Horsley.

The inclusion of self-build or custom build plots will not enable this density to be achieved as these type of developments will require a greater plot size to make them viable.

I therefore object to the inclusion of Policy site A39 as a site for 100 homes as this is not a site that is capable Of sustaining this number of dwellings the principles of Policy D4 are to be observed.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2022  **Respondent:** 8821025 / Karen McQuaid  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Site A39 – I OBJECT to the proposed development on this site on the grounds of access. It is on a stretch of the Ockham Road North which narrows as it approaches the railway bridge. Traffic at present has to slow down at that point particularly if there is a lorry on the same stretch of road. The pavement at that point is narrow and is regularly used by school children, commuters and shoppers. There is no viable way of widening the road to improve pedestrian safety.

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

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3054  **Respondent:** 8821377 / Marion Garrett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I object to Ockham Road North Site A39
1) Dangerous access. Two near to the Bridge.

2) Flooding. Road and existing houses already at risk.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/130  **Respondent:** 8823553 / Rick Day  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

The use of this site would appear to blur the distinction between East and West Horsley. Since East Lane and the roads from it are all in West Horsley and your own designation has it that this site is in East Horsley that would appear self-evident. Therefore use of this site would appear to be against the policy for the inset villages of retaining a distinct identity. Presuming that access will be from Ockham Road this site should be reduced to provide a green space boundary between the new development and Heatherdene of at least 75m.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1511  **Respondent:** 8832513 / Richard Russell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I **OBJECT** to this proposal because, quite apart from the fact that the land is on the flood-plane, development is totally impractical because of the hugely inherent dangers that will be caused by as many as 250 new cars entering the narrow Ockham Road North from this site.

This is a 'line of sight' issue because safe access from the development onto Ockham Road North will be blocked by the railway bridge. I am well aware that a prospective and seemingly well informed/confident developer, has already purchased one house (the one nearest to the railway line) and holds an agreement to purchase the second house should planning permission be granted. However and irrespective of where an access road is positioned, there will be significant road safety issues particularly with young children making their way along the narrow pavement to either Glenesk Pre-Preparatory School or The Raleigh School. It should also be noted that at drop-off and collection time at Glenesk, many parents park their car towards the railway bridge and then walk down to collect their children which will cause additional road safety issues for cars pulling out of this proposed development.

Furthermore, Ockham Road North (and South), given the narrowness of their width (having been built more for the pony & trap or stagecoach era than today's motorcars which, inevitably, means wide 4x4's, long wheel-based couriers and supermarket vehicles), already carry far too much traffic of which a significant number of drivers completely ignore the speed limit of 30mph. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) NOW and there is no land available for expansion.

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

**Attached documents:**
**Site A39: Ockham Road North, East Horsley: (100 houses)**

I **OBJECT** to this proposal because, quite apart from the fact that the land is on the flood-plane, development is totally impractical because of the hugely inherent dangers that will be caused by as many as 250 new cars entering the narrow Ockham Road North from this site.

This is a ‘line of sight’ issue because safe access from the development onto Ockham Road North will be blocked by the railway bridge. I am well aware that a prospective and seemingly well-informed / confident developer, has already purchased one house (the one nearest to the railway line) and holds an agreement to purchase the second house should planning permission be granted. However and irrespective of where an access road is positioned, there will be significant road safety issues particularly with young children making their way along the narrow pavement to either Glenesk Pre Preparatory School or The Raleigh School. It should also be noted that at drop-off and collection time at Glenesk, many parents park their car towards the railway bridge and then walk down to collect their children which will cause additional road safety issues for cars pulling out of this proposed development.

Furthermore, Ockham Road North (and South), given the narrowness of their width (having been built more for the pony & trap or stagecoach era than today’s motorcars which, inevitably, means wide 4x4’s, long wheel-based couriers and supermarket vehicles), already carry far too much traffic of which a significant number of drivers completely ignore the speed limit of 30mph. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) NOW and there is no land available for expansion.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to policy A39. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/999  
Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard  
Agent: 

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

I object. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1459  
Respondent: 8850433 / Ian Doherty  
Agent: 

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no 'very special circumstances' to justify housing development upon it,

*I OBJECT to Policy A39 to which I would also observe is at a density not in keeping with the village.*

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7277  Respondent: 8850689 / J Reardon Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Comment re specific site (Ockham Road North): I am especially concerned about access to this site and the safety implications. The access would appear to be close to the railway bridge on the west side of Ockham Road North, one of the busiest roads in the area and one which is heavily used by pedestrians. Heavy lorries have to move into the middle of the road in order to fit under the railway bridge (which has been hit several times by such lorries). Coming from the A3, if the lorry drivers see that there is nothing coming the other way, they often move into the middle of the road earlier than they might, right at the point of the supposed access point. This WILL cause an accident at some stage, either vehicular or to a pedestrian, because the sight lines will compromise traffic and pedestrian safety.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7338  Respondent: 8850881 / N Reardon Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Comment re specific site (Ockham Road North): I am especially concerned about access to this site and the safety implications. The access would appear to be close to the railway bridge on the west side of Ockham Road North, one of the busiest roads in the area and one which is heavily used by pedestrians. Heavy lorries have to move into the middle of the road in order to fit under the railway bridge (which has been hit several times by such lorries). Coming from the A3, if the lorry drivers see that there is nothing coming the other way, they often move into the middle of the road earlier than they might, right at the point of the supposed access point. This WILL cause an accident at some stage, either vehicular or to a pedestrian, because the sight lines will compromise traffic and pedestrian safety.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1224  Respondent: 8856001 / Martin Champion  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

This is currently an undeveloped Green Belt field close to the village. While many details remain to be proposed, development on this site raises issues of principle: Green Belt, flooding and proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. If this site were to remain in the MGB the proposal would be inappropriate and thus not permitted. As a large proportion of the site lies within a Functional Floodplain and a Zone 3 Floodzone, it is entirely unsuitable for residential development. The site lies within 400 metres to 5 km of the TBH SPA, and SANG will need to be found if development is to be considered.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4145</th>
<th>Respondent: 8858657 / Oliver Cass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A39 is on Metropolitan Green Belt land and I do not believe that the Council has made a defensible argument for developing on the Green Belt. As such I object to the development of site A39 on these grounds.

In addition, any site which is developed must have adequate infrastructure to support it. This includes transport, schools and flood defence. This statement is relevant for all proposed developments. In relation specifically to site A39:

- The area around Ockham Road North is already highly prone to flooding, with the road prone to severe flash floods with any heavy rain. The gardens in the vicinity frequently develop large pools of water following heavy rain. Site A39 is acknowledged to be a flood zone and is extremely boggy after heavy rain. With a significant increase in impenetrable ground, due to the roads, driveways, patios and rooves associated with 100 houses, the current problem would become worse and in my view would present a significant risk of more serious flooding causing flood damage to homes downstream of the development. I am pleased that the Council has acknowledged, within Policy A39, the need to ensure no increase in flood risk on the site or elsewhere. However, given the incidences of flood damage across the UK in recent years, it does not seem to me to be at all sensible to build such a large quantity of houses on or close to a known flood zone. Any development of the site should only be considered if the developers were required to invest the sums required to result in an improved drainage system and lower risk of flooding in all affected areas after the development had been completed compared to the current situation. Only that way can the Council be sure that its requirement for “no increase in flood risk” be achieved.

- While the site is close to the train station the train service is already extremely crowded. With additional users from site A39 and other sites proposed in the Horsley and Ockham area, it is highly likely that the trains to and from Waterloo will be standing room only. The train journey is 50 minutes.

I object therefore to the proposal for Site A39.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6708</th>
<th>Respondent: 8887009 / Jacqueline Weller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I OBJECT to Policy A39 which proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, EHPC considers that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

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

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

I OBJECT to Policy A39 which proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, EHPC considers that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to this proposal because, quite apart from the fact that the land is on the flood-plane, development is totally impractical because of the hugely inherent dangers that will be caused by as many as 250 new cars entering the narrow Ockham Road North from this site.

This is a 'line of sight' issue because safe access from the development onto Ockham Road North will be blocked by the railway bridge. I am well aware that a prospective and seemingly well informed / confident developer, has already purchased one house (the one nearest to the railway line) and holds an agreement to purchase the second house should planning permission be granted. However and irrespective of where an access road is positioned, there will be significant road safety issues particularly with young children making their way along the narrow pavement to either Glenesk Pre Preparatory School or The Raleigh School. It should also be noted that at drop-off and collection time at Glenesk, many parents park their car towards the railway bridge and then walk down to collect their children which will cause additional road safety issues for cars pulling out of this proposed development.

Furthermore, Ockham Road North (and South), given the narrowness of their width (having been built more for the pony & trap or stagecoach era than today's motorcars which, inevitably, means wide 4x4's, long wheel-based couriers and supermarket vehicles), already carry far too much traffic of which a significant number of drivers completely ignore the speed limit of 30mph. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) NOW and there is no land available for expansion.

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

Attached documents:
**Site A39: Ockham Road North, East Horsley: (100 houses)**

I **OBJECT** to this proposal because, quite apart from the fact that the land is on the flood-plane, development is totally impractical because of the hugely inherent dangers that will be caused by as many as 250 new cars entering the narrow Ockham Road North from this site.

This is a ‘line of sight’ issue because safe access from the development onto Ockham Road North will be blocked by the railway bridge. I am well aware that a prospective and seemingly well-informed / confident developer, has already purchased one house (the one nearest to the railway line) and holds an agreement to purchase the second house should planning permission be granted. However and irrespective of where an access road is positioned, there will be significant road safety issues particularly with young children making their way along the narrow pavement to either Glenesk Pre-Preparatory School or The Raleigh School. It should also be noted that at drop-off and collection time at Glenesk, many parents park their car towards the railway bridge and then walk down to collect their children which will cause additional road safety issues for cars pulling out of this proposed development.

Furthermore, Ockham Road North (and South), given the narrowness of their width (having been built more for the pony & trap or stagecoach era than today’s motorcars which, inevitably, means wide 4x4’s, long wheel-based couriers and supermarket vehicles), already carry far too much traffic of which a significant number of drivers completely ignore the speed limit of 30mph. The nearby village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) NOW and there is no land available for expansion.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1582</th>
<th>Respondent: 8919521 / Susan Hughes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY A39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station** OBJECT. The proposal to build 100 dwellings on a green-field Green Belt site can only be achieved by the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area. I believe that this is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If so, then the site must remain a part of the Green Belt. I also object because of the strain it would place on current infrastructure as outlined in Policy A36 above.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8037</th>
<th>Respondent: 8920129 / Allan Siva</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. The proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.
As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I OBJECT to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

---

1. **FLOODING**

Being a resident of Heatherdene, West Horsley, our gardens flood every winter.

The field behind our house designated “Land near to Horsley Station and next to the railway” has been earmarked in the draft local plan for one hundred houses. A large percentage of this land is FLOOD ZONE 3. During the last winter this field was on Amber alert (imminent major flooding). How can it be possible to consider a piece of land that FLOODS all the surrounding gardens, FLOODS that section of Ockham Rad North with horrendous surface water, that commuters are constantly soaked and most of them walk with there umbrellas pointed towards the floor to stop major surface water from being kicked up from cars and lorries. Recently a development of houses in Fetcham was built near a flood plain. Even though it was built with specialist foundations and drainage to protect the houses from flooding, it flooded almost immediately after sustained heavy rain. Causing the houses to be unsaleable.

The proposed entrance is too near the Railway arch on Ockham rd north, where lorries travel frequently into the middle of the road to make sure the clear the underside of the bridge.

It is an accident waiting to happen, in the truest sense!

Recently in Fetcham, a development was built on a site that floods. Even though, specialist flood resistant foundations and drainage were installed, the site flooded, causing damage to the properties and rendering them unsellable.

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

Attached documents:

---

Site A39 Land to the west of Horsley Railway Station, north of the railway line and west of Ockham Road North, East Horsley

I strongly object to the development on this Green Belt site. I wonder how well the producers of the plan even looked at the site. The reasons for objection are:

- The land is outside the settlement boundary.
- The land is in the Green Belt and adjoining undisturbed listed ancient woodland.
This site is generally very wet and is extremely wet in prolonged rainy periods. The back gardens of the properties along the edge of this field (west side of Ockham Road North and in Heatherdene) routinely have persistent surface water during the winter despite a good sized watercourse running along the eastern edge of the site. Roughly 40% of the site (the Eastern sector) is a Zone 3 floodzone and a Functional Floodplain. A Zone 3 floodzone has an annual probability of flooding of 1% or more and is the most severe category of floodzone identified by the Environment Agency. More seriously, under the Environment Agency’s definitions a Functional Floodplain comprises land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood. Land within this zone is considered to flood with an annual probability of 1 in 20 or greater in any year. Development on such land does not seem at all sensible given the flooding problems in the Borough in recent years. Serious surface water issues also occur on the road just outside this proposed site. Attempts to mitigate this water flow would also cause serious issues further north where the watercourse goes underground, back up could occur and flood adjoining properties which are designed as a development for the elderly. A near neighbour remembers walking along Ockham Road North in 1968 in calf deep water after heavy rainfall.

We understand that access will be provided just north of the rail bridge. This would be feeding 200 cars (potentially) at peak times onto a very busy, narrow road with poor sight lines for both those trying to join Ockham Road North and those driving down the road seeing the potential vehicles leaving the site. The access is also opposite one of Horsley’s Grade 2 listed historic Lovelace buildings. Completely inappropriate.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/73  Respondent: 8929057 / East Horsley Parish Council (Nick Clemens)  Agent:

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

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, EHPC considers that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, EHPC OBJECTS to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/761  Respondent: 8929057 / East Horsley Parish Council (Nick Clemens)  Agent:

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

Although small changes have been made to Site Policy A39, these are not material and GBC is still proposing to include this Green Belt site within the revised Local Plan.
In our previous Local Plan submission EIIPC asserted that the removal of this site from the Green Belt was not adequately justified by GBC or their consultants Pegasus.

In particular the change in the inset boundary proposed in the Pegasus Green Belt & Countryside Study for this site has no merit whatsoever. This study proposes the movement of the settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood, thereby removing over 5 hectares of agricultural fields from the Green Belt. The present Green Belt boundary line is defined by a deep and well-maintained drainage ditch classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘river line’. As such, this river line represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Therefore, we believe the justification for moving this boundary under current Green Belt rules is unsound.

The site also has other serious deficiencies for development with nearly a third of the land being classified as Flood zone 3. The site is also directly adjacent to an important SNCL as GBC’s revised policy has now belatedly recognised.

We trust that GBC will also belatedly recognise the serious deficiencies of this site and remove it altogether from the Local Plan. Until such time:

**EHPC strongly OBJECTS to Site Policy A39, land near Horsley railway station**

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3022  Respondent: 8934657 / Nigel Watson  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although small changes have been made to Site Policy A39, it seems GBC is still proposing to include this Green Belt site within the revised Local Plan. I object to this. In its previous Local Plan submission East Horsley Parish Council concluded that the removal of this site from the Green Belt was not adequately justified by GBC or their consultants Pegasus. They argued that the change in the inset boundary proposed in the Pegasus Green Belt &amp; Countryside Study for this site has no merit whatsoever. The Pegasus study proposes the movement of the settlement boundary westwards from behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North up to the eastern boundary of Lollesworth Wood, thereby removing over 5 hectares of currently farmed land from the Green Belt. However, the present Green Belt boundary line is defined by a deep drainage ditch, classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘river line’. As such, this river line represents a highly defensible Green Belt boundary. Therefore, I concur with the Parish Council view that there is no justification for moving this boundary under current Green Belt rules. The site also has other serious deficiencies for development with much of the land being classified as a flood zone. The site is also directly adjacent to an important SNCL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7786  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the allocation of land at Ockham Road North, EH – allocation

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4321  **Respondent:** 8948385 / Gillian Eve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Site A39 - Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, West Horsley

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7217  **Respondent:** 8948385 / Gillian Eve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1278  **Respondent:** 8958369 / B.P. Austin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

1. I object to policy Site A39.( by the Railway Line) This is currently in the Green Belt with a clear and defensible boundary of a deep ditch. Moving the boundary to the edge of Lollesworth Wood will impact on this ancient woodland. This is an area of Ockham Road North that is subject to regular surface water flooding with a
drainage system unable to cope. Part of the site is zone 3 floodplain. The proposed density of housing is greater than in the surrounding area. Should this proposal be continued the number of houses should be substantially reduced to lessen the flooding effect of more impermeable surfaces and to provide adequate space for flood prevention measures including the creation of a pond and a wetland which could have biodiversity benefits.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2730  Respondent: 8971745 / Catesby Estates Limited  Agent: Barton Willmore (Gavin Gallagher)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39

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

Policy A39: Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley

The Site is included in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017) as a draft allocation (Site Allocation A39 – Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley) for approximately 100 dwellings. We welcome and support the Site’s removal from the Green Belt and its identification as a Site Allocation for approximately 100 dwellings. As set out in our response to Policy P2 below, the Site does not serve any of the five purposes of the Green Belt identified in paragraph 80 of the Framework. Furthermore, the Site is highly sustainable and is a logical solution in delivering much needed housing. Overall it is considered important for the Council to retain the Site’s allocation to ensure that the Borough’s housing needs can be met.

Part of the changes made to the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites (2017), Draft Policy A39 identifies a requirement for this site allocation for approximately 100 homes to include some self-build and custom housing plots. As set out in our response to Policy H1 below, we support the principle of the requirement for self-build and custom housebuilding on sites providing 100 homes or more. We however object to a requirement to provide some self-build and custom house building plots on this site if less than 100 homes are delivered. We suggest the wording of the policy is amended to require some self-build and custom housing plots on this site for a scheme comprising 100 homes or more. If less than 100 homes are provided on this site the policy should not require any some self-build and custom housing plots. We consider this is a reasonable approach that would be consistent with Policy H1.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4142  Respondent: 9050337 / Nigel Geary  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe,
then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I object to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6050</th>
<th>Respondent: 9237953 / Patricia Wood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed Ockham Road North development. It has major problems of access. There is a Nursery and Pre-Preparatory School very close by and another, much larger Primary School in the vicinity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4046</th>
<th>Respondent: 9237953 / Patricia Wood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also strongly OBJECT to Site Policy A39, land near Horsley railway station. The present Green Belt boundary line is defined by a deep drainage ditch, which is classified by the Environment Agency as a ‘river line’. Much of the land there is classified as Flood Zone 3 and so not appropriate for development. The site is also very close to to an important SNCI. Please listen to the residents of the borough and do not completely wreck this beautiful area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5278</th>
<th>Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A39: Land near Horsley Railway Station, East Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT</strong> on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT</strong> on the grounds that approximately one third of this site is in Flood Zone 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT on the grounds that the access to this site would have non-complaint visibility splays and that the impact on local traffic would be excessive.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2623  **Respondent:** 9412065 / Stephen Bray  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Site A39 - Ockham Road North:

Although strictly being in East Horsley, this site is also on the north side of the railway line, and is directly adjacent Horsley station. Areas of West Horsley would greatly benefit from a foot/cycle path running alongside this site on the northern side of the railway line to afford easy and safe commuter access to Horsley station.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1170  **Respondent:** 9577857 / Nick Wilkinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I object to this development based on the density and impact on the centre of the village and direct impact this will have on the area. My reasoning:

- The village is congested at key times in and around the shops and station and this will increase that congestion. In addition this will increase the pressure on local amenities and services, already at capacity in some cases to handle the current population. This development will have a negative impact on capacity

- The development also creates the precedent to allow large size developments on village green spaces; the mitigation of allowing Green corridors to allow wildlife is not needed if the site remains undeveloped

- The development also results in the playing fields being entirely encircled, which is a clear indication this area will be approved for development in future; this is a further loss of amenity (currently used by the Raleigh School and other groups

- The current transport provision is at capacity, with station carparking full, inadequate retail parking, limited on-street parking; I do not want to a development which necessitates the increase in parking under tarmac to meet the demands of more traffic

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

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

My objection follows on from my comments above in the section “Policy P2: Green Belt, b) Paragraph 4.3.16 and Proposals Map: Settlement Boundary changes in East Horsley”.

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. This is dependent upon the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area.

The NPPF is quite clear that every movement in settlement boundaries must be justified by ‘exceptional circumstances’. I do not believe this policy demonstrates any such circumstances and is therefore unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. Therefore the housing development proposal would be invalid.

I OBJECT to Policy A39 as it fails to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to move the settlement boundary.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/1370  Respondent: 10826177 / Paul Collins  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

With reference to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A39</th>
<th>Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses proposed</td>
<td>C100 (c3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Clandon and Horsley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have a number of concerns in relation to the proposed removal of site A39 and Horsley overall from the green belt:

- **There is no safe access to this proposed site.** The access proposed raises major Health & Safety issues. Even at present the close proximity of the railway bridge means access from driveways to Ockham Road North at this
point is restrictive & dangerous in normal hours. At peak commuting and school hours this is even worse and becomes very dangerous and accidents have happened at this point.

- **Local flooding is a major concern at this site** The proposed site builds on land which is at the moment acts as a flood plain curbing the issue which already exists about local flooding which doesn’t just occur with heavy downpours but also with light rain showers.

- At this point **Ockham Road North becomes dangerous** as it floods beyond the curb height and as such pedestrians and cars are put in danger.

- Many houses on Ockham Road North **experience significant domestic flooding** and this site will make them even more susceptible. The flood issue also has a major impact on domestic drainage and means that toilets, sinks and bath water backs up and becomes a health & safety issue. This site will substantially increase the susceptibility of the local housing and infrastructure to the risk of flooding.

- **False criteria for proposing to take Horsley from green belt** There is a lack of understanding of the area in relation to the description and therefore false criteria on which the draft has been proposed eg: The East vs West Horsley point above, the designation of Station parade is completely misleading and bears no resemblance to a few village shops and a small franchised convenience store and an infrastructure which can ill cope with existing residential need.

- **Infrastructure**: No-where in the plan has infrastructure been addressed. It is already an intolerably long wait to access the local GP’s and dentists at a base level. Nor is there any mention of the already inadequate lane (they cannot even be designated as roads) & footpath structure.

- **Local employment is minimal** and the majority of the resident population have to travel to and from the village using either an already inadequate road system or public transport and no additional car parking which again is already limited.

- Overall the proposal to take Horsley from the green belt and this proposed site does not take into account major flooding and infrastructure issues and as a consequence is at best not viable and at worst dangerous at a number of levels.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5846  **Respondent:** 10826177 / Paul Collins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I have a number of concerns in relation to the proposed removal of Horsley from the green belt and site A39.

- There is no safe access to this proposed site. The access proposed raises major Health & Safety issues. Even at present the close proximity of the railway bridge means access from driveways to Ockham Road North at this point is restrictive & dangerous in normal hours. At peak commuting and school hours this is even worse and becomes very dangerous and accidents have happened at this point.

- Local flooding is a major concern at this site. The proposed site builds on land which is at the moment acts as a flood plain curbing the issue which already exists about local flooding which doesn’t just occur with heavy downpours but also with light rain showers.

- At this point Ockham Road North becomes dangerous as it floods beyond the curb height and as such pedestrians and cars are put in danger.

- Many houses on Ockham Road North experience significant domestic flooding and this site will make them even more susceptible. The flood issue also has a major impact on domestic drainage and means that toilets, sinks and bath water backs up and becomes a health & safety issue. This site will substantially increase the susceptibility of the local housing and infrastructure to the risk of flooding.

- False criteria for proposing to take Horsley from green belt. There is a lack of understanding of the area in relation to the description and therefore false criteria on which the draft has been proposed eg: The East vs West Horsley point above, the designation of Station parade is completely misleading and bears no resemblance to a few village shops and a small franchised convenience store and an infrastructure which can ill cope with existing residential need.
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Infrastructure: No-where in the plan has infrastructure been addressed. It is already an intolerably long wait to access the local GP’s and dentists at a base level.

Lanes: There is no mention of the already inadequate lane; as they cannot in most situations be designated as roads; & footpath structure which are already inadequate and poor in structure.

Local employment is minimal and the majority of the resident population have to travel to and from the village using either an already inadequate road/lane system or public transport and no additional car parking is planned which again is already limited. Overall the proposal to take Horsley from the green belt and this proposed site does not take into account major flooding and infrastructure issues and as a consequence is at best not viable and at worst dangerous at a number of levels.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1561  Respondent: 10843905 / G King  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site Allocation A39 – Object

This area already has water drainage problems. The proposed access area to the site has poor visibility along Ockham Road North where the sight line is blocked by a railway bridge and the road floods. It also backs onto ancient woodland.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6862  Respondent: 10843905 / G King  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site Allocation A39 – Object

This area already has water drainage problems. The proposed access area to the site has poor visibility along Ockham Road North where the sight line is blocked by a railway bridge and the road floods. It also backs onto ancient woodland.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1381  Respondent: 10846945 / Sarah Jezard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Objection to East Horsley local plan

With reference to:

A39  Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road North, East Horsley

Houses proposed C100 (c3)

Location Village

Ward Clandon and Horsley

I have a number of concerns in relation to the proposed removal of Horsley from the green belt and site A39

- **There is no safe access to this proposed site.** The access proposed raises major Health & Safety issues. Even at present the close proximity of the railway bridge means access from driveways to Ockham Road North at this point is restrictive & dangerous in normal hours. At peak commuting and school hours this is even worse and becomes very dangerous and accidents have happened at this point.

- **Local flooding is a major concern at this site** The proposed site builds on land which is at the moment acts as a flood plain curbing the issue which already exists about local flooding which doesn’t just occur with heavy downpours but also with light rain showers.

  At this point **Ockham Road North becomes dangerous** as it floods beyond the curb height and as such pedestrians and cars are put in danger.

  Many houses on Ockham Road North **experience significant domestic flooding** and this site will make them even more susceptible. The flood issue also has a major impact on domestic drainage and means that toilets, sinks and bath water backs up and becomes a health & safety issue.

- **False criteria for proposing to take Horsley from green belt.** There is a lack of understanding of the area in relation to the description and therefore false criteria on which the draft has been proposed eg: The East vs West Horsley point above, the designation of Station parade is completely misleading and bears no resemblance to a few village shops and a small franchised convenience store and an infrastructure which can ill cope with existing residential need.

  **Infrastructure:** No-where in the plan has infrastructure been addressed. It is already an intolerably long wait to access the local GP’s and dentists at a base level.

  **Lanes:** There is no mention of the already inadequate lane; as they cannot in most situations be designated as roads; & footpath structure which are already inadequate and poor in structure.

  **Local employment is minimal** and the majority of the resident population have to travel to and from the village using either an already inadequate road/lane system or public transport and no additional car parking is planned which again is already limited.

Overall the proposal to take Horsley from the green belt and this proposed site does not take into account major flooding and infrastructure issues and as a consequence is at best not viable and at worst dangerous at a number of levels.

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

Attached documents:
A39: Land near Horsley Railway Station, Ockham Road North

Site A39 is on Metropolitan Green Belt land and I do not believe that the Council has made a defensible argument for developing on the Green Belt. As such I object to the development of site A39 on these grounds.

In addition, any site which is developed must have adequate infrastructure to support it. This includes transport, schools and flood defence. This statement is relevant for all proposed developments. In relation specifically to site A39:

- The area around Ockham Road North is already highly prone to flooding, with the road prone to severe flash floods with any heavy rain. The gardens in the vicinity frequently develop large pools of water following heavy rain. Site A39 is acknowledged to be a flood zone and is extremely boggy after heavy rain. With a significant increase in impenetrable ground, due to the roads, driveways, patios and rooves associated with 100 houses, the current problem would become worse and in my view would present a significant risk of more serious flooding causing flood damage to homes downstream of the development. Given the incidences of flood damage across the UK in recent years, it does not seem to me to be at all sensible to build such a large quantity of houses on or close to a known flood zone. Any development of the site should only be considered if the developers were required to invest the sums required to result in an improved drainage system and lower risk of flooding in all affected areas after the development had been completed compared to the current situation.

- While the site is close to the train station the train service is already extremely crowded. With additional users from site A39 and other sites proposed in the Horsley and Ockham area, it is highly likely that the trains to and from Waterloo will be standing room only. The train journey is 50 minutes.

I object therefore to the proposal for Site A39.

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

Attached documents:
Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station

OBJECT. I object to building on a green-field Green Belt site. Moving the boundaries to achieve this is unjustified. The infrastructure cannot sustain these houses.

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

In particular, site A39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station

I wish to make it clear that I have read and fully support all of East Horsley Parish Council's comments on the draft plan. I have not repeated them here, but please take that as understood.

I wish to take particular note of plans to build in section A39. My comments are as follows:

1) This is land designated as Green Belt and it is not clear to me that a redesignation is permissible under the reasons given in the local plan.

2) There is and can only be limited access to the site and any further access will require new road junctions onto Ockham Road North which at certain times of day is already heavily congested.

3) There is already a severe problem with drainage in the area and the plot in question regularly floods. The Environment Agency have recorded this risk. Adding residential property to this site will only exacerbate these problems and place both any new dwellings and those existing buildings in the area at greater risk of flooding. This risk does not appear to have been considered in any of the assessments and should at the very least necessitate a pause while the appropriate survey work is conducted.

4) The borough council have already proved themselves to be incapable of maintaining the sewerage systems to a standard that can deal with the level of rainwater run off currently required. Ockham Road North regularly floods. There is no evidence to suggest that this will be any better in future and additional housing stock will only make it worse.

5) There is no evidence of demand for this type of housing in the area.

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

Attached documents:
I live on Ockham Road North in East Horsley in front of the proposed siting of the 100 houses – A39.

I object to this site for numerous reasons. Firstly the field is an enormous flood plain which is either saturated with water or bone-dry and cracked – due to the soil constituents being mostly clay. Our garden is exactly the same. Every time it rains, the water creeps up the garden and threatens to flood our house and my neighbours’ houses. This is also aggravated by the run off from the railway line.

If any houses are built on the site, where will this water go? Our houses will flood for sure. Given the size of the site, how can any flood measures guarantee to handle all the water from 5.7 acres? The small stream between our garden and the site will not be able to handle it all.

Further when it rains the drains running from our houses out to the road are incapacitated and do not allow water to drain so that water comes back up into the house. This has happened this summer and so can only become worse in the winter. With the climate changing in the UK with less frequent but greater downfalls, this can only add to the impact. Adding more pressure to the drainage network is not acceptable. Are the developers prepared to fully indemnify every householder on Ockham Road North for the cost of moving and the loss of value of their house if the flood measures were ineffective?

Demolishing the 2 houses next door but one to us will also result in huge noise pollution as residents from this site drive in and out. We live in East Horsley because it is a quiet village and in the Green Belt. To have an additional 100 houses behind us will change the nature and character of the village.

It should also be noted that, in the mornings and evenings, it is virtually impossible to pull out of our drive. How much worse will it be when there are potentially another 100 cars trying to pull out or turn in at those times?

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1743  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

I Object to Policy A39.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6711  Respondent: 11090145 / Tim Good  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Objections to Guildford Borough Council Plan proposals for Horsley, specifically proposed housing development, West of Ockham Road North, ‘Site Allocation A39’
I would like to register three specific objections, summarised below, to the proposal for development of the land adjacent to Ockham Road North (‘Site Allocation A39’) in the GBC Proposal’ arising from the proposal to remove this area from the Greenbelt around Horsley.

The land above, comprising open pasture, is flanked on one side by the Stratford Brook and its floodplain and on the other by the ancient Lollesworth Woods. As such it comprises an integral part of the greenbelt both for Horsley and the wider area. The land is flat, poorly drained, flood prone and unsuitable for application of ‘Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes’ (SUDS) that would mitigate these risks. Access to the site is also problematic given the drainage problems on Ockham Road North (see below, Objection 1). These concerns and some of the evidence to support them are summarised in the three objections below:

**Objection 1. Frequent Flooding on Current Access Road to Ockham Road site**

Horsley residents using Ockham Road North, one of the main road and pedestrian routes through the village, are familiar with the hazards arising from overflowing storm drains and standing water that accumulates in this area whenever heavy rainfall is experienced (for example on July 15th, 2016, photography available). There are several areas on Ockham Road North that suffer from inadequate storm drainage, however the most severe appears to be just north of the railway bridge and coincident with the proposed entrance to the A39 site. This common experience of Horsley residents is corroborated by the current Environment Agency (EA) flood maps which also show a high risk of flooding from surface water along this section of Ockham Road North. In addition to these issues on Ockham Road North the only access to the site appears to be via a new road (see GBC A39 map) across land designated as Zone 3 flood risk by the Environment agency (see EA flood map for planning), raising questions about the resilience of this route for access by the emergency services.

**Objection 2. Flood Prone Character of Site A39**

The land comprising Site A39 is virtually flat. British Geological Survey (BGS) maps and boreholes show that the fields are underlain by a thin (< 1m) veneer of sand and gravel above the thick impermeable London Clay Formation (see also Objection 3 for implications of the latter). These sands and gravels comprise the deposits of streams that flowed through the area from the high chalk downland south of Horsley towards the Thames Basin to the north in the recent geological past when climate was somewhat wetter than present. Today, the Stratford Brook which flows north to south across the area is a modern remnant of this older drainage system and is classified as a ‘Main River’ by the Environment Agency. Environment Agency maps show that ~ 30-40% of the land outlined in GBC Site A39 (excluding area used for access road to Ockham Road North) comprises the floodplain of the Stratford Brook and fall within the Environment Agency highest Zone 3 Flood Risk classification.

Just as with the poor drainage along Ockham Road North the experience of local residents adjacent to the fields comprising Site A39 confirms the location of flood prone areas suggested by Environment Agency maps. Observations of standing water and additional streams not shown on current maps, both in winter and summer however, suggest the EA maps may actually underestimate frequency of flood events and hence current and longer term risks. Hence the Evidence Base for current evaluation of the local drainage may be inadequate.

**Objection 3. Unsuitability of Land for ‘Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes’ (SUDS)**

The land comprising Site A39 is unsuitable for ‘Sustainable Urban Drainage Schemes’ (SUDS) that would commonly be used to mitigate the additional runoff/flood risk associated with development of the site, according to a recent British Geological Survey Report (BGS Report GR_205554/1, September 2014) focussed on this area. The occurrence of the impermeable London Clay Formation at shallow depths (<1m) across the entire site suggests a very high likelihood of persistent or seasonally shallow groundwater. As a consequence, engineered solutions, such as infiltration ponds, to cope with additional runoff caused by development would probably not be satisfactory (see map).

**In summary,** there are three objection about the suitability of the land adjacent to Ockham Road North (Site A 39) for development and hence no justification for removal of this land from the Greenbelt. Specifically:

1. The approach roads are poorly drained and the single access point crosses an EA Zone 3 floodplain.
2. All of the land comprising Site A39 formed a floodplain in the recent geological past. Approximately 30-40% of land (excluding approach road) now comprises the floodplain of Stratford Brook and has the highest EA Zone 3 flood risk classification.

3. The area is poorly drained and unsuitable for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) schemes that might mitigate risks associated with development according to the British Geological Survey (BGS).

Significantly, the experience of local residents tends to confirm the accuracy of the current Environment Agency Maps regarding the location of flood prone areas associated with Site A39.

Hence I urge the Council to maintain the current settlement boundaries and Green Belt land around Horsley and reject proposals for development of the land comprising Site A39.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT TO site A39 land near Horsley railway station.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/885  Respondent: 15247265 / Aileen Aitcheson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as I believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I OBJECT to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/892  Respondent: 15247745 / Brian Aitcheson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as I believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I OBJECT to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1361  Respondent: 15298849 / Elaine Burns  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39
POLICY A39: Land behind Ockham Road North, near Horsley railway station

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

There are no 'very special circumstances' to justify housing development on this site. I object to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1449  Respondent: 15323041 / Jane Doherty  Agent:

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

Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no 'very special circumstances' to justify housing development upon it,

*I OBJECT to Policy A39 to which I would also observe is at a density not in keeping with the village.*

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2968  Respondent: 15348513 / Daniel Marshall  Agent:

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

On Policy A39 arbitrary wording has been added to include self-building or custom building plots within the allocation of 100 dwellings in order to make the policy compliant with national legislation as opposed to what is appropriate for the site. The allocation of 100 dwellings on site contravenes Policy 1D4 which inter alia states that: "Ensure appropriate density to make the most efficient use of the land whilst responding to local character and context". 100 houses on a 5.7ha site does not respond to local character and context given the nature of the immediately surrounding houses and the general established density of development in the village of East Horsley. The inclusion of self-build or custom build plots will not enable this density to be achieved as these type of developments will require a greater plot size to make
them viable. I therefore object to the inclusion of Policy site A39 as a site for 100 homes as this is not a site that is capable of sustaining this number of dwellings if the principles of Policy D4 are to be observed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3523  Respondent: 15452385 / Alasdair Good  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A39

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

Environmental Impact of Proposed Housing in Horsley: Flood Risk

Building the large numbers of houses proposed in the Draft Local Plan will significantly increase the risk of flooding. I strongly object to the proposal in the Draft Local Plan for housing development in Ockham Road North, adjacent to Horsley station. This housing would be located in a floodplain. Housing on this site will adversely affect local drainage patterns, having a knock on effect further down the drainage basin. Increase in the volume of run-off due to paving over of arable land, coupled with higher incidence of flash-flooding caused by Global warming, will result in a greater frequency of abnormal fluvial discharge events, beyond the capacity of the existing drainage system. This will increase the likelihood of homes in the vicinity being flooded.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2257  Respondent: 15464161 / Toby Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39

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

On Policy A39 arbitrary wording has been added to include self-building or custom building plots within the allocation of 100 dwellings in order to make the policy compliant with national legislation as opposed to what is appropriate for the site.

The allocation of 100 dwellings on this site contravenes Policy D4 which inter alia states that:
• Ensure appropriate density to make the most efficient use of tile land whilst responding to local character and context”. 100 houses on a 5.7ha site does not respond to local character and context given the nature of the immediately surrounding houses and the general established density of development in the village of Fast Horsley.

The inclusion of self-build or custom build plots will not enable this density to be achieved as these type of developments will require a greater plot size to make them viable. I therefore object to the inclusion of Policy site A39 as a site for 100 homes as this is not a site that is capable of sustaining this number of dwellings if the principles of Policy D4 are to be observed.

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

Attached documents:
Policy A39 proposes a housing development of some 100 dwellings on a 5.7 acre green-field Green Belt site behind the houses on the western side of Ockham Road North. Access is to be secured by demolishing the first two houses next to the railway bridge.

As discussed earlier, I consider that the proposed western movement of the settlement boundary needed to bring this site within the settlement area is unjustified and contrary to NPPF rules. If this boundary movement is invalid, as we believe, then this site remains a part of the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such and with no ‘very special circumstances’ to justify housing development upon it, I object to Policy A39.

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

Attached documents:
I object to the proposed building sites for Ockham Road North, East Horsley. The current village infrastructure and road system is already under strain from individual building projects. The traffic alone from these proposed new sites will be extremely damaging to the village environment, the safety of the residents and existing dwellings along the routes that will be used by building plant traffic. My house already vibrates and shakes when existing building traffic passes along Ockham Road North.

I object to the proposed building sites for Ockham Road North, West Horsley. The current village infrastructure and road system is already under strain from individual building projects. The traffic alone from these proposed new sites will be extremely damaging to the village environment, the safety of the residents and existing dwellings along the routes that will be used by building plant traffic. My house already vibrates and shakes when existing building traffic passes along Ockham Road North.

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

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

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

The proposed 135 dwellings exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3652</th>
<th>Respondent: 15689953 / Environment Agency (Oliver Rathmill)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2 Assessment of climate change
Within your plan the following four sites are based on high level flood risk information:
POLICY A39: Land near Horsley railway station, Ockham Road, North, East Horsley (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A40: Land to the north of West Horsley (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A50: Land at Whittles Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy (assessment based on Flood Zones)
POLICY A54: Lakeview, Lakeside Road, Ash Vale (assessment based on detailed flood model (Blackwater 2007) 1 in 100 year flood)
Although you have deemed these to have passed the flood risk sequential test as noted below we would expect that at planning application stage detailed flood modelling is undertaken.
We note that the new climate change allowances haven’t been specifically mentioned in the Level 2 SFRA or local plan. However, the majority of allocated sites have detailed modelling where the 1 in 1000 year (0.1% annual exceedance probability) is available, these sites have been assessed against the 1 in 1000 year flood. For the purpose of accuracy and clarity we recommend that this approach of using the 1 in 1000 year flood event to account for climate change is clearly set out in the SFRA Level 2.
If these sites are adopted, at the planning application stage we would expect an assessment of climate change (using the new allowances) to be undertaken by applicants. We recommend applicants consult with the most recent national climate change guidance including our Thames Climate change guidance.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4847</th>
<th>Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)</th>
<th>Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. Local upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are may be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a potential wastewater network capacity constraint, the developer should liaise with Thames Water to determine whether a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered is required. The detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with the planning application.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A40 - Land to the north of West Horsley
The proposals for West Horsley would result in a massive increase in village size with consequent loss of character. Simply put, there are too many homes for a village without the necessary infrastructure and the proposals constitute a major assault on Green Belt land. The current settlement area does not need to be extended. Current housing is varied in size and style and is low density as befits a village of this character. It is ill-considered and inappropriate to build clusters of 100 or so houses at much higher density.

Over the years the number of households in East and West Horsley have increased slowly due to a few houses being built each year but spread throughout the two villages. To build the 500 houses proposed would overwhelm the villages and their facilities.

The Raleigh school is oversubscribed- even children living in the Horsleys cannot all obtain a place. This school and the two independent schools create high volumes of traffic at peak times with considerable congestion at the various pinch points throughout the village.

The proposed development of over 500 additional homes in East and West Horsley will result in hundreds of additional school-aged children in need of a school place. This is ill-considered and not supportable.

Both of the major roads running through the village (B2039 and East lane/The Street) are crossed by low, railway bridges and each have pinch-points where the roads very narrow. On East Lane, very close to proposed major developments, there is a very narrow section which does not permit twoway traffic flow. East Lane is therefore particularly unsuited to significant increase in traffic flow. The Street frequently floods and is impassable after heavy rain. Residents would have to commute to work via A3 or A246 or drive through East and/or West Horsley to get to the station or school.

Fields and gardens alongside Ockham Road North flood regularly and the water table is high for the majority of the year. The proposed development of site A40 would exacerbate flooding risk to neighbouring houses and roads. Flood mapping in the consultation document recognizes this problem but the site remains as one for potential development.

The proposed development site A40 also surrounds a successful and highly regarded campsite with some 130 pitches. Currently this is a quiet rural area with bountiful wildlife- deer, foxes, rabbits and a large variety of birdlife. The proposed development of site A40 would destroy this environment and most likely this successful local business.

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

Attached documents:
WHPC view: Objects strongly

In brief: All the West Horsley Sites are unsustainable, as demonstrated in the Planning Assessment Report (Appendix 2) when evaluated against NPPF Policies

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

Attached documents:

----

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4299  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Site A40 Land to the north of West Horsley

184. I object to this site being included. Guildford Borough Council have proposed moving the settlement boundary and insetting the enlarged village in order to allow a development for which there are no exceptional circumstances.

185. Waterloo Farm campsite is an important aspect of our tourist economy where visitors enjoy the countryside setting around the large pond. This development will put this campsite at risk of lowered popularity and subsequent demands for change of use.

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

Attached documents:

----

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8288  Respondent: 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Within BOA TBL02 Clandon to Bookham Parkland; development should be scaled appropriate to environmental constraints and assist achievement of BOA objectives (inc. protection, restoration & creation of Priority habitats, inc. Mixed deciduous woodland, Wood-pasture & parkland, Meadows, Hedgerows, Ponds).

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

Attached documents:

----

Comment ID: PSLPS16/906  Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

This is a very large tract of agricultural land in the green belt. It is difficult to visualise the changes to the village landscape when all of these proposals are added together, but if every piece of open land is built on it will simply be an
enormous housing estate with few amenities and no social centre. Some limit development adjacent to Nightingale Close and Nightingale Avenue to the south of the footpath/track could be absorbed but not the several acres being proposed.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7985  **Respondent:** 8709601 / Robert Fletcher  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Flood Risk and Inadequate Drainage and Sewerage

There have been drainage problems in the area around Waterloo Farm leading to localised flooding and backed up drains - about 5 years ago we had sewage across our back garden where the water level in the system had risen above that of some of the drain covers - notably one on our property. This had backed up from the main sewer. These sewers could not cope with any further development in the area.

The area around and to the rear of Waterloo Farm is also low lying and always floods in periods of heavy or sustained rainfall. Evidence of the wetness of the area can be seen by the thriving willow trees behind Waterloo Farm. This makes this area most unsuitable for housing.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7714  **Respondent:** 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

- I object to the allocation of land at Ockham Road North, WH – allocation A40

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1209  **Respondent:** 8729313 / Lisa Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

OBJECT. Site is Greenbelt and should be protected

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Specific Comments on Potential Development Area Ref A40/ID 975 (Land at Waterloo Farm/ Ockham Road North)

I am making detailed comments only about this site because it is in close proximity to where I live, and therefore I have a greater level of understanding of some of the detailed issues. I am sure that similar concerns will be raised by other locals in connection with each of the other potential development areas, and my opposition is to all of the potential development as are around West Horsley, as well as the redesignation of Green Belt Boundaries, rather than just this site.

With reference to this site, I believe that development on this site would cause an unacceptable increase in the risk of surface water flooding affecting existing houses in areas such as Ockham Road North and Nightingale Avenue. These are already designated as Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium and high risk) as is part of this development site and as mentioned above, surface water flooding has been an issue here in recent years.

I also have concerns about how this site could be accessed. Both Green Lane and the current small access road to the Camping and Caravan Site do not provide good road access for a development of this size and junction access on to the Ockham Road would be dangerous. Any access through Nightingale Avenue (for example created by an additional access point at the North of the road) would also not be suitable. Once again, the junction onto Nightingale Avenue would not safely carry additional traffic, and the road network is already under particular strain during the school run. This route is also not suitable or safe for additional pedestrian access (and pedestrian access down Ockham Road North is also challenging as it requires crossing the road several times). At present there are no footpaths along Nightingale Avenue and it is not possible to widen what is a small residential road in order to allow safe access.

Whilst partially enclosed by housing, especially to the East, this site comprises pleasant fields which help to contribute to the rural character of the village, and to the semi-rural character of the housing stock along Ockham Road North. This proposed development would therefore sit on a gateway into the village. At present the village gradually becomes more developed as one drives down the Ockham Road and enters East Horsley, or turns into East Lane to continue through West Horsley. Significant development here, with attendant infrastructure such as highway improvements or pedestrian crossings, would significantly alter the rural context of the village by creating a far more stark and harsh boundary to the village.

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

Attached documents:
in connection with each of the other potential development areas, and my opposition is to all of the potential development areas around West Horsley, as well as the redesignation of Green Belt Boundaries, rather than just this site.

With reference to this site, I believe that development on this site would cause an unacceptable increase in the risk of surface water flooding affecting existing houses in areas such as Ockham Road North and Nightingale Avenue. These are already designated as Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium and high risk) as is part of this development site and as mentioned above, surface water flooding has been an issue here in recent years.

I also have concerns about how this site could be accessed. Both Green Lane and the current small access road to the Camping and Caravan site do not provide good road access for a development of this size and junction access onto the Ockham Road would be dangerous. Any access through Nightingale Avenue (for example created by an additional access point at the North of the road) would also not be suitable. Once again, the junction onto Nightingale Avenue would not safely carry additional traffic, and the road network is already under particular strain during the school run. This route is also not suitable or safe for additional pedestrian access (and pedestrian access down Ockham Road North is also challenging as it requires crossing the road several times). At present there are no footpaths along Nightingale Avenue and it is not possible to widen what is a small residential road in order to allow safe access.

Whilst partially enclosed by housing, especially to the East, this site comprises pleasant fields which help to contribute to the rural character of the village, and to the semi-rural character of the housing stock along Ockham Road North. This proposed development would therefore sit on a gateway into the village. At present the village gradually becomes more developed as one drives down the Ockham Road and enters East Horsley, or turns into East Lane to continue through West Horsley. Significant development here, with attendant infrastructure such as highway improvements or pedestrian crossings, would significantly alter the rural context of the village by creating a far more stark and harsh boundary to the village.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7162</th>
<th>Respondent: 8790465 / Nigel Baxter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A stables use the land in the northern half of this plot and clearly further erosion of land available for this sort of recreation puts further pressure on the provision of suitable land for the local population to indulge in healthy outdoor pursuits.

Access to these fields is quite restricted being already surrounded by existing housing. Access required for large vehicles for development would create considerable disruption. The loss of view and amenity provided to all these houses by being adjacent to the countryside would be of huge detriment to these residents who enjoy this outlook, myself included.

I am sure that within the Guildford Borough many more “brown field” and urban sites can be identified rather than creating huge development in the villages of Surrey.

Clearly there are other areas in West Horsley that are considered for development too. All of these areas carry some of the same ill-considered reasoning for development. Overall any large increase in development within the village would seriously strain the facilities and infra structure at present in place.

As a broad outline I object to the large scale increases in building that the Proposed Submission Plan suggests. My wife and I strongly disagree with the removal of the Green Belt Status from the villages of Surrey and in particular that of West Horsley.
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2024  Respondent: 8821025 / Karen McQuaid  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ). is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this proposal at Waterloo Farm because this particular tranche of land for a number of reasons which include the fact that this land is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from the combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and indeed still floods regularly. This site is on flat land with clay soil on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from any new development will simply accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. Furthermore, the envisaged development misjudges the problems of safe access which are definitely not simply limited to flooding. Nor will they be overcome by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Worthy of note is that repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police: this despite the fact that data collected in 2015 clearly demonstrated that traffic volume had doubled in the past 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been permitted and additional housing of this magnitude (120 houses I 300 cars) will merely add to the existing hazards along this narrow and already dangerous stretch of road.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1512  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ). is Sound? ( ). is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this proposal at Waterloo Farm because this particular tranche of land for a number of reasons which include the fact that this land is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from the combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and indeed still floods regularly. This site is on flat land with clay soil on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from any new development will simply accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. Furthermore, the envisaged development misjudges the problems of safe access which are definitely not simply limited to flooding. Nor will they be overcome by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Worthy of note is that repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police: this despite the fact that data collected in 2015 clearly demonstrated that traffic volume had doubled in the past 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been permitted and additional housing of this magnitude (120 houses I 300 cars) will merely add to the existing hazards along this narrow and already dangerous stretch of road.

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

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2065  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A40: Ockham Road North, West Horsley: (120 houses)

I OBJECT to this proposal at Waterloo Farm because this particular tranche of land for a number of reasons which include the fact that this land is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from the combination of a high groundwater table a lack of surface water run-off. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and indeed still floods regularly. This site is on flat land with clay soil on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from any new development will simply accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. Furthermore, the envisaged development misjudges the problems of safe access which are definitely not simply limited to flooding. Nor will they be overcome by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Worthy of note is that repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police: this despite the fact that data collected in 2015 clearly demonstrated that traffic volume had doubled during the past 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been permitted and additional housing of this magnitude (120 houses / 300 cars) will merely add to the existing hazards along this narrow and already dangerous stretch of road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7628  Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A40 (West Horsley) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of West Horsley

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8255  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to policy A40 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy 40 – I Object. By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This is contrary to Policy E5 – Rural Economy.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly.

The site access for such a large number of houses is dangerous. Highways England and Surrey Police, show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed on this section of Ockham Road is 52mph, with maximum speeds of over 80mph. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road.

The boundary of this site is also the proposed new Green Belt and settlement boundary. Its north western boundary is not defendable as it just runs through the middle of a field/garden. Some trees have been recently planted in token gesture to create a green belt boundary. This was to overcome access issues of the past - another wrong does not make it right!

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

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/5825  ** **Respondent:** 8847969 / Anthony Tutt  ** **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Surface Flooding Danger to existing properties due to run off from the proposed Waterloo Farm site.

With specific reference to the proposed 120 home Waterloo Farm site which is closest to my home post coded GU236PD. Junction Ockham Road North and Green Lane.

I sincerely believe that if the Waterloo Farm site is permitted my home will be flooded.

I believe other households might be similarly affected; and I wonder whether we might succeed in an action against Guildford Borough Council for negligence.

Could the council also be prosecuted for deliberately enabling the health risks associated with flooding to afflict local residents?

**The Environment Agency’s own mapping shows that parts of the waterloo farm site are likely to be subject to flooding.**
This has already been mentioned as a problem area for potential development in the Pegasus report for the original discarded local plan.

One day in 2000 huge amounts of water ran down Ockham Road North from East Horsley, and water ran through the front gardens too.

From November 2012 until February/March 2013 the entire area around West Horsley South and East Horsley North was completely waterlogged. Sometimes water flowed over the roads instead of beside them.

In January 2014 diluted sewage flowed over Green Lane not far from the junction with Ockham Road North due to waterlogged land and inadequate drainage. This year the ditches have again been overflowing onto Green Lane.

There is an onward slope towards Ripley and Ockham. Extra water due to run off must ultimately end up there increasing flood risk.

Climate change science indicates that periods of heavy rainfall and flooding are likely to increase in future years.

It is madness to build on land that must hold and slowly drain down hundreds of thousands if not millions of gallons of water.

**Access to Waterloo Farm using Green Lane and/or the camp site road is clearly inadequate.**

Both of these roads are single carriageway only. In addition they both join into Ockham Road North which is a winding road with limited visibility in places and a 40mph limit which is generally ignored. Often speeds of 60mph have been recorded just where traffic would emerge from Green Lane. There is very poor visibility for all drivers. Increased traffic flow into and out of these two junctions would inevitably lead to accidents in these circumstances.

The Green lane Ockham Road North Junction is particularly risky.

Green Lane is specifically used by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders (there is a nearby holistic riding school) for recreation because it is a low traffic country lane, and also provides a safe corridor for them between similar use areas. In addition it provides a space for humans to interact with wild and pet animals which are life enhancing to us all.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to this proposal at Waterloo Farm because this particular tranche of land for a number of reasons which include the fact that this land is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from the combination of a high groundwater table a lack of surface water run-off. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and indeed still floods regularly. This site is on flat land with clay soil on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from any new development will simply accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. Furthermore, the envisaged development misjudges the problems of safe access which are definitely not simply limited to flooding. Nor will they be overcome by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Worthy of note is that repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police: this despite the fact that data collected in 2015 clearly demonstrated that traffic volume had doubled in the past 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been permitted and additional housing of this magnitude (120 houses / 300 cars) will merely add to the existing hazards along this narrow and already dangerous stretch of road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7457  Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Site A40: Ockham Road North, West Horsley: (120 houses)

I OBJECT to this proposal at Waterloo Farm because this particular tranche of land for a number of reasons which include the fact that this land is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from the combination of a high groundwater table a lack of surface water run-off. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and indeed still floods regularly. This site is on flat land with clay soil on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from any new development will simply accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. Furthermore, the envisaged development misjudges the problems of safe access which are definitely not simply limited to flooding. Nor will they be overcome by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site entrance. Worthy of note is that repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police: this despite the fact that data collected in 2015 clearly demonstrated that traffic volume had doubled during the past 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum recorded speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have so far been permitted and additional housing of this magnitude (120 houses / 300 cars) will merely add to the existing hazards along this narrow and already dangerous stretch of road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5809  Respondent: 8903841 / Anne Tutt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The Waterloo Farm site off Ockham Road North is land subject to a high flood risk, so should not be built upon. If the Council allows it to be built upon, my home will flood.

Access to Waterloo Farm would be via single-carriageway lanes with poor visibility, wholly inadequate for the likely volume of construction traffic, residents’ traffic and suppliers’ traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7360  Respondent: 8915905 / Rhiannon Stroud  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

I object to Policy A40, near Horsley Railway

40% of this proposed development site is zone 3 floodzone and Functional Floodplain. There are drainage ditches that serve the site and run behind the properties in Heatherdene. There is also a winter stream that runs from this site across the back of nos. 10, 11 and 12 Heatherdene and down under the ground through Weston Lea. The stream runs for about 3 months of the year and appears to have been completely missed by the Environment Agency’s maps of the site. Clearly, an area that already deals with a lot of water flow is unsuitable for housing development. In addition, an access junction beside the railway bridge in Ockham Road North will cause a lot of delay and potential danger with difficult sightlines on an already busy road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7169  Respondent: 8926689 / Sarah Douglas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

I OBJECT TO WATERLOO FARM SITE, BORDERING GREEN LANE

SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS TO BUILDING 120 HOUSES ON THE LAND ADJACENT TO GREEN LANE, GU23 6PQ

DRAINAGE: We live directly next to one of the borders of this site, at the end of the smaller Green Lane. We have had to dig a deeper ditch next to this field due to rain water filling and spilling out of this drainage ditch. We can see that the field becomes very boggy and are concerned about the standard of drainage the developers would put there. How will the current drainage points cope?

LOCAL SEWERAGE: The main Green Lane now becomes flooded and water runs down like a river after each heavy rain storm. Faeces and used toilet roll have seeped out of the drain and pushed up the cover on several occasions. Some tarmac from the road has also been pushed up. The council have repaired this and it has still happened again.
It smells and is a very unpleasant sight. If the local council are not repairing this to a standard where it does not happen again, how can they ensure drainage and sewerage will be sustainable for such a large increase in housing?

**THE INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSED IS NOT ADEQUATE AND SUSTAINABLE**

The plans propose a cycle and pedestrian footpath to come off the Waterloo Farm site, directly on to the part of Green Lane with the leaked sewerage.

**I STRONGLY OBJECT TO ANY FURTHER FOOTPATH OR ROAD ACCESSING GREEN LANE.**

**TRAFFIC ON GREEN LANE**

This is a narrow road with currently much foot traffic, including a popular dog walking area. Horses are kept on either side of Green Lane and there are 2 dog day care facilities, all of which have to use Green Lane for access and exit.

There are no footpaths and it is too narrow to build them. A gas pipe runs down one side and a stream is on the other, which due to the level of REGULAR flooding down the road. It would be disastrous if the stream was filled in, as it’s vital for drainage in the area.

More local houses along Long Reach and Ockham Road North being allowed to use Green Lane as a cut through, would be dangerous.

The amount of pedestrians, horse riders, dog walkers and cars currently needing to use Green Lane is enough.

**I OBJECT TO MORE CARS AND PEDESTRIAN’S ACCESSING GREEN LANE. IN MY OPINION IT WOULD BECOME DANGEROUS FOR THOSE OF US, INCLUDING CHILDREN, HORSES AND DOGS WHO LIVE ON GREEN LANE AND USE IT DAILY.**

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/7785  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies   Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

I object to the allocation of land at Ockham Road North, WH – allocation

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/4322  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve   Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:
Policy A40: land at Waterloo Farm, West Horsley

I OBJECT on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2624</th>
<th>Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A40 - Waterloo Farm:

At the northern periphery of the village, this site has a northern link to Green Lane which could feasibly be improved to afford a safe and pleasing route for walkers and cyclists down to Long Reach and Ripley Lane beyond. The southern boundary backs onto Nightingale Crescent and Northcote Crescent but with no way through towards Horsley station, whereby the only feasible direct route is along the busy Ockham Road North, having a pavement on one side but again with no dedicated cycle way.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3880</th>
<th>Respondent: 10662849 / Garry Walton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.

Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events that accompanies climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly.

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

Attached documents:
Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly.

These problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site access. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:
Please see below a summary of a number of concerns which I have in relation to the proposed removal of site A40 from the green belt:

Firstly as the access is shown on the proposed the site is actually in East Horsley and not West Horsley.

There is no safe access to this proposed site. The access proposed raises major Health & Safety issues. Even at present the close proximity of the railway bridge means access from driveways to Ockham Road North at this point is restrictive & dangerous in normal hours. This is exacerbated at peak hours of school and going & coming back from work times at which it becomes very dangerous and accidents have happened at this point.

The proposed site builds on land which is at the moment curbing the issue which already exists about local flooding which doesn’t just occur with heavy downpours but also with light rain showers – example pictures are available.

At this point Ockham Road North becomes dangerous as it floods beyond the curb height and as such pedestrians and cars are put in danger.

The flood issue also has a major impact on domestic drainage and means that toilets, sinks and bath water backs up and becomes a health & safety issue. This site will substantially increase the susceptibility of the local housing and infrastructure to the risk of flooding.

There is a lack of understanding of the area in relation to the description and therefore false criteria on which the draft has been proposed eg: The East vs West Horsley point above, the designation of Station parade is completely misleading and bears no resemblance to a few village shops and a small franchised convenience store and an infrastructure which can ill cope with existing residential need.

No-where in the plan has infrastructure been addressed. It is already an intolerably long wait to access the local GP’s and dentists at a base level. Nor is there any mention of the already inadequate road & pavement structure.

Local employment is minimal and the majority of the resident population have to travel to and from the village using either an already inadequate road system or public transport and no additional car parking which again is already limited.

Overall this proposed site does not take into account major flooding and infrastructure issues and as a consequence is at best not viable and at worst dangerous at a number of levels.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5760  Respondent: 10858753 / Carole Warren  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

I strongly object to the development of Waterloo Farm, Horsley

Planning permission for 3 dwellings was rejected in 2014

The land is regularly flooded and waterlogged

The area is categorised as a Paddock, with mature trees and wildlife.

There is insufficient access routes for households or emergency services.

120 dwellings would have massive impact on traffic on the Ockham Road

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

Attached documents:
Development of greenbelt land in the Horsleys (plots: Waterloo Farm, Manor Farm, East lane, Bell and Colville, Ockham Road North

1. Is the information on which the housing projects been made sound?

Population forecast form the ONS- recent data from the ONS (SNPP 2012) suggest that migration into the borough is much lower than the figures used when the Local Plan was compiled. In addition international migration accounts for between a half and two thirds of Guildford's population growth and it is this international migration that is now being discouraged by central government further reducing the need for such a large number of houses to be built. Therefore, proposed building should be adjusted likewise. Before development is allowed to encroach on greenbelt areas existing brownfield sites must be used and then an assessment as to the need for more houses made.

1. How will the proposed increase in houses affect the character of the Horsleys?

NPPF paragraph 158 states that "Each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.” How have the Horsleys been defined as a Rural District Centre? The draft Local Plan states that Station Parade has a large supermarket. Surely Budgens cannot be described as a large supermarket, being classified under the Sunday Trading Act 1994 as a small shop or convenience store? The classification of the Horsley as Rural District Centre is flawed and as such must be amended and the impact of this classification on the local plan corrected.

In addition, the local plan proposes to increase the number of houses in the Horsleys by nearly 35%. How can such an increase in the number of houses preserve the character of the area? Such an increase will result in the villages no longer being villages.

1. Has sufficient provision been made for infrastructure and amenities?

- parking
- roads
- schools
- public transport
- medical facilities
- drainage

The local plan needs to consider the parts of a development needed in addition to houses. If a village or town were being built from scratch houses would form just a small proportion of the overall development. Other areas to be considered would include drainage, roads, schools, medical facilities, shops, parking. In my comments on the use of StMartin's Close site for development I have touched upon current demands on schools, drainage, parking- all of which will be further negatively impacted by allowing development of the greenbelt areas of the Horsleys.

Development of the greenbelt areas and the potential influx of people into the village will also place further demand on public transport. Horsley station is already very busy with trains being very full. The Horsley bus service is sporadic and often not at times or bus stops that are convenient or needed.

Greater numbers of people will also place demand on the local Medical Centre where booking an appointment that is not required as an emergency can be difficult.
More people will also mean more cars. The Horsleys are villages with roads that are typical of a village- being winding and narrow. These roads are already suffering from increased traffic flow and delivery lorries, becoming pot holed and of a poor standard. The roads are also used by other people. The Horsley are popular with cyclists, especially following their inclusion in the Olympic cycle route. On many of the roads visibility, due to the winding and narrow nature of the roads, is poor meaning that overtaking cyclists is often risky and dangerous. Further road users would make the roads more congested and dangerous. Many of the village roads have no pavements meaning that pedestrians have to walk along the narrow winding roads. More cars will deter pedestrians further adding to the number of cars on the road.

**Guildford Borough Council’s use of terminology**

How much control will GBC have over future development as the plan uses language where developers are "expected and should follow" what GBC say? This language is non directive. Surely developers must and should be required to comply with GBC directives on the houses built.

In conclusion, although there is a need for increased provision of housing in the borough I feel that the data on which the local plan has been based is flawed, meaning the conclusions based on these figures not sound. In addition, the plan has made no consideration as to retaining the character of the villages or infrastructure and amenities that a large development would need.

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

**Attached documents:**

The density of new housing on the 6 Horsley sites is inappropriate, being greater than anywhere in the locality now.

Sites situated on the periphery of existing development in the Horsleys encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries for which the plan presents no arguments. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, this will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

Collectively, these 6 sites militate against NPPF paragraph 81’s encouragement of access to the Green Belt and its amenity and recreation value. This has been a success story in the Horsleys, with the creation of an amenity wood and community garden, the purchase of adjacent fields (East of Ockham Road North) by local residents in order to preserve their open aspect, well-maintained pitches for local football and cricket clubs, public tennis courts, open space for a high-quality campsite (at Waterloo Farm) used by many foreign tourists and the approval of plans for a “Theatre in the Woods” – making West Horsley the only village in Surrey with an opera house. The open nature of West Horsley determined that a long portion of the 2012 Olympic cycle races passed through the village. This route has been adopted by cyclists as a permanent asset, including the annual Prudential cycle race. These and future examples of “positive planning” depend on protecting the Green Belt to maintain the openness and attractiveness of the local landscape and avoiding the urbanisation and traffic congestion that Sites A36-41 will bring.

By surrounding Waterloo Farm campsite with 120 new houses, Policy A40 on land to the North of West Horsley will make this rural tourism amenity unviable. This may accord with developers’ plans, since the site would then be vulnerable to infilling with yet more housing.
Site A40 is subject to an unacceptable flood risk from a combination of a high groundwater table and the lack of surface water run-off. This is flat, clay land on the downhill side of the Horsleys where floodwater from new development will accumulate and back up onto existing properties nearby. I can provide photographs proving how badly these fields already flood at present. These problems will only get worse with the increase in extreme weather events that accompanies climate change. The “appropriate mitigation” suggested in Policy A40 exists only as an abstract notion. It should not overrule the need for Green Belt “exceptional circumstances”.

Policy A40 underestimates the problems of safe access and egress. Ockham Road North was closed for several weeks in 2014 because of flooding, and still floods regularly.

These problems are not confined to flooding and are not addressed by the proposal to extend the existing 30mph zone past the site access. Repeated attempts made by Ockham Road North residents to extend this zone have been turned down by the local authorities, Highways England and Surrey Police, even though data collected in 2015 show that traffic has doubled over the last 15 years and that the average speed in the 40mph section of this road is 52mph, with maximum speeds of over 80mph. No traffic calming measures have been achieved. Additional housing will add to several hazards along this stretch of road, including:

- Its use by pedestrians, especially children (using the Raleigh and Glenesk schools and catching school buses to Guildford and Howard of Effingham), pensioners living in the string of bungalows at the northern end of the road, and visitors from the Waterloo campsite who are unfamiliar with the area.
- The existence of a narrow footpath on only one side of the road in any one spot. The layout means that walking half a mile between Green Land and East Lane requires crossing the road twice.
- The road’s increasing use by recreational cyclists (see above).
- Its winding nature, poor sight lines (especially when interrupted by summer vegetation) and dangerous, concealed driveways. Most of these were built in the 1930s. Some have been widened but many are too narrow for modern traffic. Since a deep ditch runs along most of the road, vehicles have to swing out dangerously when entering or leaving.
- The prospect of additional traffic, including 19,000 HGV movements (90 a day over a long period) if Surrey County Council approves the Drift Golf Course’s planning application to re-landscape its site using bulk waste transported from London.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3174  Respondent: 11015009 / Laura Fletcher  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

Plot A40

I particularly object to developing the land, currently part of the curtilage of Waterloo Farm. The site is rural in character and enhances the setting of the historic farmhouse. This would be unacceptable backland development. The site is regularly waterlogged and floods (as does our back garden and the campsite). Houses on this site would further exacerbate drainage problems in this area. The main sewer which crosses the site would also constrain development. The settlement boundary along the rear boundaries of properties on Nightingale Crescent should be retained.

The amount of development proposed for East and West Horsley is out of proportion with the rest of the Borough. It is unbalanced and unfair to propose such a high level of housing in one small village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7163  Respondent: 11041953 / Elizabeth Baxter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

A stables use the land in the northern half of this plot and clearly further erosion of land available for this sort of recreation puts further pressure on the provision of suitable land for the local population to indulge in healthy outdoor pursuits.

Access to these fields is quite restricted being already surrounded by existing housing. Access required for large vehicles for development would create considerable disruption. The loss of view and amenity provided to all these houses by being adjacent to the countryside would be of huge detriment to these residents who enjoy this outlook, myself included.

I am sure that within the Guildford Borough many more “brown field” and urban sites can be identified rather than creating huge development in the villages of Surrey.

Clearly there are other areas in West Horsley that are considered for development too. All of these areas carry some of the same ill-considered reasoning for development. Overall any large increase in development within the village would seriously strain the facilities and infra structure at present in place.

As a broad outline I object to the large scale increases in building that the Proposed Submission Plan suggests. My wife and I strongly disagree with the removal of the Green Belt Status from the villages of Surrey and in particular that of West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7537  Respondent: 11058913 / Tarn Stroud  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT ESPECIALLY TO POLICY A40:

This land is currently Green Belt land used for agriculture and should not be used for housing development. In addition, part of the land is a level 3 flood risk and Ockham Road North, to the east of the development is frequently awash with flowing water following heavy rain.

The winter stream flowing west to east along the southern end of Heatherdene and the school playing field as yet does not overflow in times of heavy rain. However, this stream is not shown in current Environment Agency maps used for planning drainage requirements.

Water seepage, pooling and flooding on Ockham Road North to the north of the railway bridge in East Horsley regularly poses a great hazard to pedestrians due to splashing from cars, coaches and lorries. As the road is not very wide, and pedestrian pavement is only on one side of the road, vehicles often pass very close to the pedestrian making the splashing hazard not just unpleasant but also dangerous, particularly for children. In winter, this stretch of Ockham Road North and the pedestrian pavement are often covered in black ice, even after dry weather, due to the water seepage onto the road and pavement.

This underlying geology of the area is an impermeable layer of clay only about one meter beneath the surface. The Local Plan provides no protection for the existing residents of Heatherdene and Ockham Road North that areas that do not currently flood will not become prone to flooding as a result of development on the adjacent site.

Safe access and egress at Site A40 unachievable, owing to the regular flooding of Ockham Road North to the north of the railway bridge and poor sight lines, narrow access to existing properties and inadequate pavements for elderly and schoolchildren.

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

Attached documents:
2.1 Figure 1 shows the area of land owned by Mr and Mrs Neilson outlined in yellow. The land has been promoted as part of a wider development site which is outlined in red has been identified as a housing allocation for circa 120 units in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and is referred to as Land to the North of West Horsley, under policy A40.

2.2 A substantial part of the wider development site is owned by a developer in the form of Persimmon Homes. We have been in discussions with Persimmon Homes relating to the inclusion of their land within the allocation and there is a will on all sides to collaborate if that represents the best outcome for addressing the broader housing needs of the

2.3 The land to the west of the proposed allocation is heavily wooded and this mature landscape boundary is an important feature in containing the site from future sprawl. The woodland to the west of the proposed allocation might be too small to be used as formal SANGS land, however it could be made available to the public to assist with offsetting the perceived impact development may have on the Thames Basin SPA. It should therefore also be included as part of the allocation.

2.4 To the south west of the site is a lake, with housing development to the south eastern, eastern and northern boundaries. Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land parcel, and the wider site is therefore well contained both physically and visually.

2.5 The land currently lies within the Green Belt and adjoins the village of West Horsley (North). The site, along with all of the other proposed West Horsley allocation sites in the Proposed Submission Local Plan are within 400m to 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Proposed Submission Local Plan however states that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) is likely to be available in the area.

2.6 The latest survey carried out by West Horsley Parish Council identified a local tolerance of up to 75 new dwellings in the village within the Local Plan. Assuming the entire proposed allocation site at Oakland Farm can be built out, it has the potential capacity for circa 120 units and therefore it could easily provide the required housing numbers within a single, self-contained site.

2.7 There is no relevant planning history for Mr and Mrs Neilson’s part of the identified allocation site beyond a certificate of lawful use or development for a small extension to an existing pool house. This does not affect the area being promoted for development.

2.8 The proposed allocation site has since been assessed as being Suitable, Available and Achievable in the SHLAA June 2014, Ref: 975, 2027, 1. It was also identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as a site allocation for new homes and was identified as a potential development area within the Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) Ref: C14-A.

3 KEY CONSIDERATIONS

The Proposed Submission Local Plan document sets out the site in Policy A40. It identifies the key considerations as:

- Flood risk
- Surface water flood risk
- Access

FLOOD RISK

3.1 The Environmental Agency flood mapping identifies part of the overall site as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however only the very north east tip of Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land (being the position of the existing residential dwelling) is shown as being within Flood Zone 2 or 3.

3.2 Persimmon have however carried out their own flood modelling of the site and surrounding area and the results confirm that neither the site nor the access roads are within Flood Zone 2 or Figure 2 below shows the flood modelling carried out by Persimmon which clearly demonstrated that there is no flood risk to the site or the access roads:
3.3 Persimmon have confirmed that their own flood risk assessments stipulate:

‘flood risk as previously identified by the Environment Agency is not as was initially thought. Capita has rated the site as a ’4’ with regards to flood risk suitability. This score means that the site is of less concern with regards to flooding. The conclusions reached by Capita as part of this SFRA was that “area to the north east of the site is shown to be within the Flood Zone 3. Should development be avoided in these areas, and appropriate SuDS developed on site…..it is likely that the site could pass the technical part of the Exception Test”. The surrounding area of the site is predominately in Flood Zone 1 as identified by Capita therefore there is little or no flood risk with this.

In addition to the work undertaken by Capita, Persimmon has carried out its own detailed flood modelling for the site and the immediate surrounding area. This modelling was carried out on a worst case scenario and the outcome of this was that under this scenario, Ockham Road North and importantly the access into the site remains dry and is not subject to flooding. The modelling work also incorporated climate change allowances in line with newly released Environment Agency/DCLG guidance. This detailed modelling has clearly shown the Environment Agency’s mapped flood extents to be overestimating the actual scenario and further advances Capita’s assessments. Therefore, Persimmon are of the opinion that the unreliability of the Environment Agency data should not be used further and that the more detailed and up-to-date, site-specific modelling carried out as part of our assessments should be relied upon.’

3.4 The flood risk has been addressed through Persimmon’s flood risk modelling and assessment which will be submitted as part of their representations for the wider site.

3.5 It should be highlighted that Mr & Mrs Neilson’s land could be brought forward independently in any event as a stand-alone site.

ACCESS

3.6 Access was also identified as a key considerat Access is however not a risk to the deliverability of Mr and Mrs Neilson’s site as there are two existing vehicular access points that could serve the land parcel. The first is controlled by Mr and Mrs Neilson, and is the access off Green Lane which currently serves Oakland Farm. It should be noted that whilst Green Lane itself is a relatively narrow road, the Highways boundary extends significantly beyond the existing line of tarmacadam, and can easily be widened. All necessary upgrades would be made to the road, regarding widening and improving its surface, as well as the junction with Ockham Road North. The second is an existing vehicular right of way across the track running west off Ockham Road North, which is being proposed by Persimmon as the principal access to their site. Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land could therefore be accessed without the need for any land acquisition and is deliverable with or without the development of the wider allocation site.

3.7 The site is also well connected on foot, with a permissive path running adjacent to the west of the subject woodland, around the camp site, to Bens Wo This woodland is understood to have been planted in 2001 as a public amenity, with funding through the EU and DEFRA through the Countryside Stewardship Scheme. Further, there are extensive footpaths via Whitehall Lane, which is at the junction of Green Lane and Ockham Road North, being only some 250 yards from the property.

3.8 The site at Oakland Farm is also within walking distance to the station and both the Raleigh School and Glenesk Pre Prep. In addition it is located within close proximity to the nearest accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace, as identified in the East Horsley and West Horsley (North) Sustainability Assessment Walking Distance The site is located one mile away from the centre of East Horsley where much of the local facilities which can serve residents’ day-to-day needs are found. These facilities include a number of local shops, including a Budgens convenience store, a newsagents, post office, pharmacy and bank. The village hall lies to the rear of these shops and is easily accessible from the main high street. The main line rail station is also located close to the high street and this allows access to London Waterloo via a direct train which takes under an hour and includes stops at larger stations such as Leatherhead, Epsom, Wimbledon and Clapham Junction allowing access to large employment areas and facilitating onward travel.

3.9 The settlement hierarchy, published in May 2014 and used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan, notes that East Horsley has a population of 3,785 (2011) and is ranked as the 3rd most sustainable location within the
borough (out of 32). In addition to the highly rated sustainability of East Horsley, the site lies close to West Horsley which is ranked as the 13th most sustainable location within the borough (out of 32).

4 GREEN BELT

4.1 The final key restriction regarding the development of the proposed allocation site at Oakland Farm is its Green Belt. West Horsley is a medium sized village which was identified in the Local Plan Strategy Issues and Options to be removed from the Green Belt. The proposed allocation site is completely enclosed and as such the risk of future development sprawl is minimal.

4.2 There are 5 purposes to the Green Belt which have been set out below in relation to this proposed allocation site.

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

4.3 The proposed allocation site adjoins the medium sized village of West Horsley which is not considered to be a large built up. To the north, east and south east of the site is existing residential development. To the west and south is a mature tree belt and lake, forming natural barriers to future development sprawl. It is therefore considered that this site is not required to be in the Green Belt in order to prevent the village from sprawling.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

4.4 The nearest other settlement to the site is Ockham, some 1.25km away. West Horsley is currently detached from Ockham by Green Lane which runs along the north of the site, as well as a further 25km of open countryside and farms. To the west is Send Marsh, separated by 6.5km of open countryside as well as the A3 and further smaller roads. It is therefore the case that development of the proposed, well contained site, could have little if any impact in respect of the merging of neighbouring towns and there is therefore no necessity for the site to remain within the designation to support that aim.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

4.5 As set out in the two points above, the site is surrounded by existing residential development and a strip of mature woodland. Development of the site would therefore fill a gap in the pattern of existing residential development and would not encroach into the open countryside.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

4.6 West Horsley is not considered to have any special or historic character. Paragraph 86 of the NPPF states that if the character of the village needs to be protected for reasons beyond its contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, ‘other means should be used, such as Conservation Area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.’ This section of the village is not considered to contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt and as such it should be excluded.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

4.7 The West Surrey SHMA found that the objectively assessed need was 1,729 homes per annum for the region between 2013 and 2033, 693 of which are to be provided within the Guildford local planning area per annum. It is therefore necessary for the Local Planning Authority to consider a range of sites, both brownfield and green. Of course brownfield sites should be developed first, however the Council has recognised that the existing available brown field sites within the area are not sufficient to meet current housing requirements. There is therefore a clear indication that the Council will need to identify Greenfield land, much of which will be Green Belt if it is to meet housing requirements. On this basis there is a strong case for this identified site to be removed from the Green Belt to allow for beneficial development.

4.8 The proposed allocation site was identified in the SHLAA 2014 as having development potential for circa 114 flats or houses on the basis of a density of 14 dp. It was identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as an allocation site for approximately 120 dwellings.
5 CONCLUSION

5.1 This planning appraisal has been carried out by the professional planning team at Batcheller Monkhouse on behalf of Mr and Mrs Neilson, regarding the land at Oakland Farm, Green Lane, Ockham Road North, West Horsley, to be submitted as formal representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan Consultation.

5.2 The land at Oakland Farm has been identified as part of a wider site for allocation in the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan (policy A40), much of which is owned by Persimmon. The Proposed Submission Local Plan raises key considerations for the site which include flood risk and access. It is considered that both these matters have been addressed in this planning appraisal, with reference made to an independent flood risk assessment and flood modelling commissioned by Persimmon, and confirmation that the vehicular access is already secure. The owners of Oakland Farm are in ongoing discussions with Persimmon, as well as a number of other builders who are keen and willing to develop Oakland Farm.

5.3 This appraisal considers the site in the context of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and finds that it makes no contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, nor does it contribute to the purposes of including land within the des. The land should therefore remain as an allocation in the final version of the Local Plan and should be removed from the Green Belt as has been proposed. The site would provide a range of good quality houses within the next 1-5 years in a suitable location with minimal visual impact. There is minimal risk of outward expansion of the site in the future, and the site is capable of providing the full housing requirement for West Horsley.

5.4 It is therefore considered that this land is the preferred allocation site for the village and should remain as such moving forward to the final version of the Local Plan. The owners will continue to promote the site for residential development in the immediate term and have substantial developer interest.

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

Attached documents: 2016-07-15 Oakland Farm reps to Submission Local Plan HR-CJT FINAL.pdf (574 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7741  Respondent: 11151969 / A. Neilson  Agent: Batcheller Wakefield (Caroline Wakefield)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This planning appraisal has been carried out by Batcheller Monkhouse on behalf of Mr and Mrs Neilson, to provide an up to date site assessment of land at Oakland Farm, Green Lane, Ockham Road North, West Horsley in the context of the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1.2 The land at Oakland Farm has been identified for allocation in the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan as part of a wider site referred to as Land to the North of West Horsley, under policy A40. The purpose of this report is to address why this proposed allocation site should continue to be included in the final version of the Local Plan and why the site should be removed from the Green Belt.

1.3 This document provides a brief description of the site, designations and restrictions, a brief review of key considerations raised in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and an assessment of the contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The previous representations which were submitted to the Council in March also included an assessment of the site in relation to competing sites also identified as housing allocations in the Draft Local Plan.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
2.1 Figure 1 shows the area of land owned by Mr and Mrs Neilson outlined in yellow. The land has been promoted as part of a wider development site which is outlined in red. The wider area outlined in red has been identified as a housing allocation for circa 120 units in the Proposed Submission Local Plan and is referred to as Land to the North of West Horsley, under policy A40.

2.2 A substantial part of the wider development site is owned by a developer in the form of Persimmon Homes. We have been in discussions with Persimmon Homes relating to the inclusion of their land within the allocation and there is a will on all sides to collaborate if that represents the best outcome for addressing the broader housing needs of the borough.

2.3 The land to the west of the proposed allocation is heavily wooded and this mature landscape boundary is an important feature in containing the site from future sprawl. The woodland to the west of the proposed allocation might be too small to be used as formal SANGS land, however it could be made available to the public to assist with offsetting the perceived impact development may have on the Thames Basin SPA. It should therefore also be included as part of the allocation. There is a permissive path adjoining the woodland.

2.4 To the south west of the site is a lake, with housing development to the south eastern, eastern and northern boundaries. Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land parcel, and the wider site is therefore well contained both physically and visually.

2.5 The land currently lies within the Green Belt and adjoins the village of West Horsley (North). The site, along with all of the other proposed West Horsley allocation sites in the Proposed Submission Local Plan are within 400m to 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA. The Proposed Submission Local Plan however states that Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) is likely to be available in the area.

2.6 The latest survey carried out by West Horsley Parish Council identified a local tolerance of up to 75 new dwellings in the village within the Local Plan period. Assuming the entire proposed allocation site at Oakland Farm can be built out, it has the potential capacity for circa 120 units and therefore it could easily provide the required housing numbers within a single, self-contained site.

2.7 There is no relevant planning history for Mr and Mrs Neilson’s part of the identified allocation site beyond a certificate of lawful use or development for a small extension to an existing pool house. This does not affect the area being promoted for development.

2.8 The proposed allocation site has since been assessed as being Suitable, Available and Achievable in the SHLAA June 2014, Ref: 975, 2027, 13. It was also identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as a site allocation for new homes and was identified as a potential development area within the Green Belt and Countryside Study (GBCS) Ref: C14-A.

3. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

The Proposed Submission Local Plan document sets out the site in Policy A40. It identifies the key considerations as:

- Flood risk
- Surface water flood risk
- Access

FLOOD RISK

3.1 The Environmental Agency flood mapping identifies part of the overall site as being within Flood Zones 2 and 3, however only the very north east tip of Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land (being the position of the existing residential dwelling) is shown as being within Flood Zone 2 or 3.

3.2 Persimmon have however carried out their own flood modelling of the site and surrounding area and the results confirm that neither the site nor the access roads are within Flood Zone 2 or 3. Figure 2 below shows the flood modelling carried out by Persimmon which clearly demonstrated that there is no flood risk to the site or the access roads:

3.3 Persimmon have confirmed that their own flood risk assessments stipulates:
‘flood risk as previously identified by the Environment Agency is not as was initially thought. Capita has rated the site as a ‘4’ with regards to flood risk suitability. This score means that the site is of less concern with regards to flooding. The conclusions reached by Capita as part of this SFRA was that “area to the north east of the site is shown to be within the Flood Zone 3. Should development be avoided in these areas, and appropriate SuDS developed on site…..it is likely that the site could pass the technical part of the Exception Test”. The surrounding area of the site is predominately in Flood Zone 1 as identified by Capita therefore there is little or no flood risk with this.

In addition to the work undertaken by Capita, Persimmon has carried out its own detailed flood modelling for the site and the immediate surrounding area. This modelling was carried out on a worst case scenario and the outcome of this was that under this scenario, Ockham Road North and importantly the access into the site remains dry and is not subject to flooding. The modelling work also incorporated climate change allowances in line with newly released Environment Agency/DCLG guidance. This detailed modelling has clearly shown the Environment Agency’s mapped flood extents to be overestimating the actual scenario and further advances Capita’s assessments. Therefore, Persimmon are of the opinion that the unreliability of the Environment Agency data should not be used further and that the more detailed and up-to-date, site-specific modelling carried out as part of our assessments should be relied upon.’

3.4 The flood risk has been addressed through Persimmon’s flood risk modelling and assessment which will be submitted as part of their representations for the wider site.

3.5 It should be highlighted that Mr & Mrs Neilson’s land could be brought forward independently in any event as a stand-alone site.

ACCESS

3.6 Access was also identified as a key consideration. Access is however not a risk to the deliverability of Mr and Mrs Neilson’s site as there are two existing vehicular access points that could serve the land parcel. The first is controlled by Mr and Mrs Neilson, and is the access off Green Lane which currently serves Oakland Farm. It should be noted that whilst Green Lane itself is a relatively narrow road, the Highways boundary extends significantly beyond the existing line of tarmac, and can easily be widened. All necessary upgrades would be made to the road, regarding widening and improving its surface, as well as the junction with Ockham Road North. The second is an existing vehicular right of way across the track running west off Ockham Road North, which is being proposed by Persimmon as the principal access to their site. Mr and Mrs Neilson’s land could therefore be accessed without the need for any land acquisition and is deliverable with or without the development of the wider allocation site.

3.7 The site is also well connected on foot, with a permissive path running adjacent to the west of the subject woodland, around the camp site, to Bens Wood. This woodland is understood to have been planted in 2001 as a public amenity, with funding through the EU and DEFRA through the Countryside Stewardship Scheme. Further, there are extensive footpaths via Whitehall Lane, which is at the junction of Green Lane and Ockham Road North, being only some 250 yards from the property.

3.8 The site at Oakland Farm is also within walking distance to the station and both the Raleigh School and Glensk Pre Prep. In addition it is located within close proximity to the nearest accessible natural and semi-natural greenspace, as identified in the East Horsley and West Horsley (North) Sustainability Assessment Walking Distance Plan. The site is located one mile away from the centre of East Horsley where much of the local facilities which can serve residents’ day-to-day needs are found. These facilities include a number of local shops, including a Budgens convenience store, a newsagents, post office, pharmacy and bank. The village hall lies to the rear of these shops and is easily accessible from the main high street. The main line rail station is also located close to the high street and this allows access to London Waterloo via a direct train which takes under an hour and includes stops at larger stations such as Leatherhead, Epsom, Wimbledon and Clapham Junction allowing access to large employment areas and facilitating onward travel.

3.9 The settlement hierarchy, published in May 2014 and used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan, notes that East Horsley has a population of 3,785 (2011) and is ranked as the 3rd most sustainable location within the borough (out of 32). In addition to the highly rated sustainability of East Horsley, the site lies close to West Horsley which is ranked as the 13th most sustainable location within the borough (out of 32).

4. GREEN BELT
4.1 The final key restriction regarding the development of the proposed allocation site at Oakland Farm is its Green Belt location. West Horsley is a medium sized village which was identified in the Local Plan Strategy Issues and Options to be removed from the Green Belt. The proposed allocation site is completely enclosed and as such the risk of future development sprawl is minimal.

4.2 There are 5 purposes to the Green Belt which have been set out below in relation to this proposed allocation site.

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

4.3 The proposed allocation site adjoins the medium sized village of West Horsley which is not considered to be a large built up area. To the north, east and south east of the site is existing residential development. To the west and south is a mature tree belt and lake, forming natural barriers to future development sprawl. It is therefore considered that this site is not required to be in the Green Belt in order to prevent the village from sprawling.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

4.4 The nearest other settlement to the site is Ockham, some 1.25km away. West Horsley is currently detached from Ockham by Green Lane which runs along the north of the site, as well as a further 1.25km of open countryside and farms. To the west is Send Marsh, separated by 6.5km of open countryside as well as the A3 and further smaller roads. It is therefore the case that development of the proposed, well contained site, could have little if any impact in respect of the merging of neighbouring towns and there is therefore no necessity for the site to remain within the designation to support that aim.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

4.5 As set out in the two points above, the site is surrounded by existing residential development and a strip of mature woodland. Development of the site would therefore fill a gap in the pattern of existing residential development and would not encroach into the open countryside.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

4.6 West Horsley is not considered to have any special or historic character. Paragraph 86 of the NPPF states that if the character of the village needs to be protected for reasons beyond its contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, ‘other means should be used, such as Conservation Area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt.’ This section of the village is not considered to contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt and as such it should be excluded.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

4.7 The West Surrey SHMA found that the objectively assessed need was 1,729 homes per annum for the region between 2013 and 2033, 693 of which are to be provided within the Guildford local planning area per annum. It is therefore necessary for the Local Planning Authority to consider a range of sites, both brownfield and green field. Of course brown field sites should be developed first, however the Council has recognised that the existing available brown field sites within the area are not sufficient to meet current housing requirements. There is therefore a clear indication that the Council will need to identify Greenfield land, much of which will be Green Belt if it is to meet housing requirements. On this basis there is a strong case for this identified site to be removed from the Green Belt to allow for beneficial development.

4.8 The proposed allocation site was identified in the SHLAA 2014 as having development potential for circa 114 flats or houses on the basis of a density of 14 dph. It was identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan as an allocation site for approximately 120 dwellings.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1 This planning appraisal has been carried out by the professional planning team at Batcheller Monkhouse on behalf of Mr and Mrs Neilson, regarding the land at Oakland Farm, Green Lane, Ockham Road North, West Horsley, to be submitted as formal representations to the Proposed Submission Local Plan Consultation.
5.2 The land at Oakland Farm has been identified as part of a wider site for allocation in the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan (policy A40), much of which is owned by Persimmon. The Proposed Submission Local Plan raises key considerations for the site which include flood risk and access. It is considered that both these matters have been addressed in this planning appraisal, with reference made to an independent flood risk assessment and flood modelling commissioned by Persimmon, and confirmation that the vehicular access is already secure. The owners of Oakland Farm are in ongoing discussions with Persimmon, as well as a number of other builders who are keen and willing to develop Oakland Farm.

5.3 This appraisal considers the site in the context of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and finds that is makes no contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, nor does it contribute to the purposes of including land within the designation. The land should therefore remain as an allocation in the final version of the Local Plan and should be removed from the Green Belt as has been proposed. The site would provide a range of good quality houses within the next 1-5 years in a suitable location with minimal visual impact. There is minimal risk of outward expansion of the site in the future, and the site is capable of providing the full housing requirement for West Horsley.

5.4 It is therefore considered that this land is the preferred allocation site for the village and should remain as such moving forward to the final version of the Local Plan. The owners will continue to promote the site for residential development in the immediate term and have substantial developer interest.

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

Attached documents:

- 2016-07-18 GBC re reps HR-CW.pdf (247 KB)
- 2016-07-15 Oakland Farm reps to Submission Local Plan HR-CJT FINAL.pdf (574 KB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/158  Respondent: 15127681 / Claire Long  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular I should like to OBJECT to the Waterloo Farm site (policy A40), given the impact that this will have on Green Lane as a single track road wholly unsuited to the increased volume of traffic that will inevitably result from it being used as a cut through by the residents of the new homes, together with the more general impact on the quiet rural character of the immediate vicinity. I am also concerned by the build-up of traffic on Ockham Rd North that will result from those coming from the A3 queuing to turn right into the site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/441  Respondent: 15185665 / Jan Gerrard  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Council Proposed Local Plan (June 2016) and to the continued inclusion in the plan of the Former Wisley Airfield (FWA), now known as Three Farms Meadows (TFM) – Allocation A35 - for the phased development of a new settlement of up to 2100 dwellings
I object to the draft Local Plan for the following key reasons:

- I object to a plan which proposes that over 70% of new housing be built within the Green Belt. There is ample brownfield land in the urban areas which needs to be regenerated, without the need to encroach on protected Green Belt land. Election manifesto promises to the electorate are being ignored.

- I object to the removal of the Former Wisley Airfield (FWA/TFM) from the Green Belt. The site serves a vital role in protecting against urban sprawl from London. Development on the site will create an urban corridor stretching from London to Guildford. Under the NPPF, no exceptional circumstances have been established to warrant removing the land from the Metropolitan Green Belt.

- I object to the housing number of 693 houses per year from the West Surrey Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SHMA) as far too high. This assessment and calculation process has been far from transparent and indeed is more than double the figure used in previous plans.

- I object to the disproportionate allocation of housing in this particular part of the borough. Indeed, over 23% of the Plan’s new housing is proposed in the immediate localities of Ockham, Ripley, Send and the Horsleys (of which 65% is allocated to FWA/TFM, an area that at present has only 0.3% of the population of GBC).

- I object to the threat the Local Plan poses to the historic rural village of Ockham and the blight on properties there. The plan calls for a village of 159 residences (with narrow lanes, no streetlights, very few pavements and many listed houses) to be subsumed into a 2,000+ dwelling development, with urban-style buildings up to five storeys high and a population density higher than most London boroughs.

- I object to the detrimental impact on transport, local roads and road safety. I specifically object to:
  1. The assertion that the development will result in a meaningful shift to cycling and walking. The development is too isolated, and even within the development itself too spread out to anticipate a reduced reliance on private cars
  2. The increased volume of car traffic. A proposed development of 2,068 homes would result in an estimated 4,000 additional cars on the roads
  3. The congestion this traffic will cause on the narrow rural roads in Ockham and the surrounding areas, exacerbated by wide vehicles including increased bus and HGV movements
  4. The danger this traffic will be to local cyclists and pedestrians, due to the absence of any cycling paths and the lack of pedestrian footpaths (and the space to provide them)
  5. The increase in the already severe congestion on the Strategic Road Network of the A3 and M25. A further planning application at RHS Wisley (with a significant increase in visitor traffic) and a proposed 600 pupil secondary school on the site would add additional congestion at the M25/A3 junction as well as local roads. No development can proceed without significant infrastructure enhancements to the A3 and M25. Partial improvement works on the A3 south of the site are not due to start until 2019 at the earliest
  6. The lack of suitable public transport. The local rail stations of Effingham and Horsley cannot cope with the proposed increase in passenger traffic and car parking is already at capacity

- I object to the fact that insufficient consideration has been given to the environmental and ecological value of the site, in relation to the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI).

- I object to the fact that air quality concerns have not been taken seriously – air pollution in many parts of the borough, and particularly at the M25/A3 junction, is in excess of EU-permitted levels. Additional traffic will exacerbate this situation, impacting the health of all current and future residents. No account is being taken of the acid deposition on the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the irreversible impact of the habitat degradation.

- I object to the fact that the proposed plan does not meet the needs and desires of local communities, as evidenced through the Ockham Parish Plan. The top two responses as to why local residents enjoy life in Ockham are (1) access to the countryside and clean air and (2) the peace and quiet afforded by wide open spaces. Over 90% wish to see both the historic features of the village maintained and the village’s green spaces, including the FWA/TFM, protected.

- I object to the continued inclusion of a site (the former Wisley Airfield, - now known as Three Farm Meadows) - where the planning application has already been unanimously rejected by GBC’s Planning Committee.
After 14 months of consideration (and various extensions and amendments), Wisley Property Investments Ltd’s (WPIL) planning application was unanimously rejected by GBC on 8th April 2016 on the recommendation of GBC Planning Officers, who cited the same grave concerns highlighted in this letter.

Serious concerns about this site have also been raised by a broad number of authoritative sources across the UK, including Highways England, Thames Water, NATS and the Environment Agency.

I trust that these objections will be fully considered and that the Former Wisley Airfield (Three Farms Meadows), Allocation A35, is removed from the Local Plan with immediate effect.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1201</th>
<th>Respondent: 15244097 / Persimmon Homes (Craig Hatton)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to the attached representations which includes our comments in greater detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents: [Horsley reps.pdf](8.2 MB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4084</th>
<th>Respondent: 15244097 / Persimmon Homes (Craig Hatton)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This comment refers directly to the draft allocation Policy A40: Land to the north of West Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy remains unchanged and Persimmon Homes support this. The majority of the land included within the draft allocation is land owned by Persimmon Homes. Persimmon are the UK's largest house builder with the resources and desire to build out this site. The land included within this policy remains available, developable and deliverable within the next five years. Persimmon are however concerned by the inclusion of the element of self-build and custom house building plots within the allocation. The inclusion of this is not based on any evidence formally published which suggests that there is a need or demand for these plots on this site. Persimmon Homes fully intend to build out the dwellings themselves using their own resources. It is unclear as to where these self build and custom plots would be located.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is proposed to deliver a significant proportion of local housing needs within West Horsley and is a key site for development. It is unclear as to the level of demand in the local area for custom and self-builders and the Council register is not made public. Persimmon Homes have not been approached regarding the provision of self-build and custom plots on their owned land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon would request that the reference to the custom house building and selfbuild plots are removed from this policy as the inclusion is unjustified. The inclusion of this will also jeopardise the delivery of a logical, sensitive housing development within West Horsley which will provide a suitable quantum of development, including affordable homes, in an area where this is much needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/868  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A40 land to north of West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1960  Respondent: 15303681 / Nicola Stockbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION TO REMOVE THE HORSLEYS FROM THE GREEN BELT AND SPECIFICALLY TO THE WATERLOO FARM PROPOSED SITE

I have recently moved into the area, and did so because of the countryside view open to the rear of my property, being the paddock of Waterloo Farm. I had no idea that within a matter of a few months I would be facing the prospect of potentially 120 houses being built to the rear of my property.

I would like to object to this potential site, as it would affect my privacy and light to the rear of my property. This area already suffers from drainage problems and the property to the rear is currently designated paddock. It would also majorly devalue my property as it is the privacy, light and view that I bought my home for. We also have a multitude of wildlife to the rear of the property. Deer often venture into my garden, as well as pheasants, rabbits and many birds. Bats can often be seen in the early evening sky. I seriously doubt this would occur if the paddocks and open land are replaced by new homes.

Horsley is a quiet country village, and with the amount of new homes you hope to build, this will no longer be the case. This is not why myself, and many others, have moved into the area.

I do not believe that the local infrastructure can cope with the numbers of new houses you propose. The schools are full, roads in poor condition, medical facilities stretched, drainage in this area is extremely poor and there is little parking available already.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3415  Respondent: 15303681 / Nicola Stockbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I WANTED TO ADD THE FOLLOWING TO MY OBJECTION BELOW:

I have now discovered that the land behind me (Waterloo Farm) had planning permission refused by the Council in 2014 for three detached houses to be built on my boundary for the following reasons:

R14/P/00012 on 27 Feb 2014:

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THREE DWELLINGS HAS THE POTENTIAL TO INCREASE THE RISK OF FLOODING IN AN AREA WITH A HIGH RISK OF SURFACE WATER FLOODING. NO INFORMATION HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO DEMONSTRATE HOW THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD SUCCESSFULLY MITIGATE AGAINST FLOODING. THIS IS CONTRARY TO POLICY AND G1(6) OF THE GUILDFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2003 (AS SAVED BY CLG DIRECTION ON 24/9/07) AND GUIDANCE CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK.

Further this site is constrained by:

- The main sewer along the campsite boundary.
- Sewers and surface water sewers, from Nightingale Crescent crossing the site.
- Flooding and waterlogged ground.
- Existing mature trees on the site and along the boundaries.

I would like to add that with recent weather which has included torrential rain and storms, this water runs all the way down Nightingale Crescent into my garden and literally floods the area around my home. On occasion we have been unable to leave our front door without wellingtons because of the pond that appears. Already this is a problem and will be even moreso if this development occurs.

The inclusion of this triangle of land for such a small number of new houses, would have very little impact on your housing figures. It would result in the loss of the Green Belt and create undesirable back land development behind Waterloo Farm, which I have been advised is an important historic building.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1452  Respondent: 15323041 / Jane Doherty  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A40

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

The LAA identifies six sites in West Horsley for potential development, the four largest having allocation policies within the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The total housing number arising from these six sites is 405 homes in total. For a village which had 1,124 dwellings at the 2011 Census, this represents a proportional increase of 36% over the plan period, an enormously high proportion by any standards.

The four policy sites are all located within the Green Belt. One is a partly brownfield development but the other three sites are all open fields used for agriculture and all lie within the current Green Belt at the edge of the Settlement Area. The reasons presented by the consultants, Pegasus, in the Green Belt & Countryside Study to justify these settlement boundary movements appear to me highly questionable and in no way to meet the requirements of the NPPF that such boundary movements are only to be made in ‘exceptional circumstances’. These movements clearly represent a deliberate
pushing back of settlement boundaries in order to provide more greenfield sites for housing development. As such, I consider these proposed movements in settlement boundaries to be invalid.

These proposals are also contrary to the principles of the Metropolitan Green belt. West Horsley represents one of the first 'lines of defence' against London urban encroachment outside of the M25 circle. Yet these policies will eliminate a significant part of this defence as they seek to expand the boundaries of this village and fill-in every bit of green space within this rural setting.

It is also totally contrary to the opening statement of Local Plan Policy P2 that “We will continue to protect the Metropolitan Green Belt” It seems that in West and East Horsley at least the draft Local Plan is doing exactly the opposite.

Given the scale of the development proposed in West Horsley, the inevitable destruction of its village character and the impact on infrastructure across West and East Horsley, I OBJECT to the site allocation policies A37, A38, A40 and A41.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2331  Respondent: 15385601 / Richard Fletcher  Agent:

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

I object to housing at Site A40, particularly the back land site to the SW of Waterloo Farm.

This triangle of land is constrained by:

- the main sewer along the campsite boundary
- sewers and surface water sewers, from Nightingale Crescent crossing the site
- flooding and waterlogged ground
- existing mature trees on site and along its boundaries

The inclusion of this land, for two or three houses, would have very little impact on the Council’s housing figures, but would mean the loss of the Green Belt and create undesirable back land development, which would adversely affect the character and setting of Waterloo Farm, an important local historic building. The existing ‘settlement boundary’ along the rear boundaries of Nightingale Crescent should remain.

The Council should also note that it refused an application for 3 houses here in 2014.

One of the reasons for refusal of outline planning permission for the erection of three detached dwellings (access only to be considered). R14/P/00012 on 27 Feb 2014 was:

The proposed development of three dwellings has the potential to increase the risk of flooding in an area with a high risk of surface water flooding. No information has been submitted to demonstrate how the development would successfully mitigate against flooding. This is contrary to policy and G1(6) of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 (as saved by CLG Direction on 24/09/07) and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
To whom it may concern,

We would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to the above proposed development.

We visit Horsley all the time because of the countryside feel and incidentally have friends who overlook the paddock of Waterloo Farm. We are disgusted that she will face the prospect of looking at 120 new houses.

It will undoubtedly create further noise pollution as well as affecting the light of many families’ homes as well as the privacy.

I am sure the roads & infrastructure of the area would undoubtedly not be able to cope either.

Horsley countryside preservation society. My concerns for the Horsleys and objections.

- Objections to removing Green Belt.
1. Loss of countryside which provides recreation and space for our children to connect with nature, so vital in mental health in this electronic age.
2. Such a large increase in population- 533 new houses- will increase traffic congestion and also impact on rail services locally.
3. The suggested increase in land available, noted in ‘extension of boundaries’ clause, must be [scraped] on- an invidious practice our supermarkets indulge in.
4. The housing plan must include downsize and affordable houses.

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

Attached documents:
1.7 Detailed Planning permission, since lapsed, was granted in 2010 (Ref 10/P/01550) for conversion of the barn to two residential units. An outline planning application was made for 3 dwellings at the southern end of the site in 2014 (Ref 14/P/00012). The application was refused essentially on the grounds of policy (Green Belt) It is clear that GBC have considered the Site suitable for residential development albeit in the event of a change of current policy towards the Green Belt.

1.8 The Site is included in the draft emerging Local Plan as a housing allocation of 120 units as part of a wider allocation including land held by Persimmon Homes. Persimmon Homes are also submitting a Representation for Policy A40. The Site has been promoted through the Local Plan process since 2008 and we are very pleased to see it included as part of a draft allocation and strongly support this.

1.9 The Site is surrounded by immediate residential development. The argument for sustainable development is enhanced by the existing established housing that encircles Policy A40, and which runs along Green Lane, Ockham Road North and Nightingale Avenue.

1.10 The Site is sustainable, available and deliverable and can provide for housing within the next five years to meet GBC short term need.

1.11 The proposed adjustment of the Settlement Boundary, as it effects Waterloo Farm, could be described as “rounding off” and would complement a nucleated pattern of development appearing as a natural, unobtrusive extension to the existing boundary.

2.0 HOUSING AND POLICY CONTEXT

Guildford BC planning context & housing numbers

2.1 This representation is in response to the Regulation 19 consultation phase for the pre-submission version of the draft Local Plan. WYG are pleased to have been given the opportunity to make representations on this concerning the Site and general planning matters within the Borough. WYG are also pleased that Guildford BC has acknowledged the significant challenges that the borough faces in delivering sufficient housing to meet its needs. The previous interim housing figure of 322 dwellings per annum agreed in May 2012 did not take account of up to date assessments of housing need and therefore was not NPPF compliant. The reliance on this figure has meant that Guildford BC has significantly under-delivered on their housing requirements over the past five years as shown in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Net completions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 As the housing completions above show, Guildford has not only been under-delivering against the now up-to-date Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) but there has also been consistent under-delivery against the interim housing target.

2.3 The most recently produced Annual Monitoring Report (AMR), published in October 2015 for the period 2014/2015 showed that net completions of dwellings in the borough for this period was 242 and that the majority of homes completed in this period are on sites of under 20 homes. As the AMR notes:
“The number of new homes completed this year (2014/15) is still lower than required to meet our objectively assessed need…contributes to a growing deficit of new homes”.

2.4 The recommendation within the AMR following this states that:

“Housing provision is currently restricted by the lack of available and deliverable development land in the borough….delivery rate is only likely to increase when larger areas of land are suitable and available for development”.

This shows the necessity for suitable and available sites to be considered and this should apply to all sites within the borough that meet this criteria. Our client is the landowner of Waterloo Farm and the Site is available for development. We have set out below the reasons as to why the site should be considered suitable and deliverable in order to assist in the supply of land to contribute to meeting the chronic housing needs in the Borough. Consideration should be given to the Site as suitable and available regardless of its designations.

Objectively Assessed Need

2.5 Guildford Borough has an identified (OAN) of 693 dwellings per annum following the conclusions of the West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) produced in September 2015 by GL Hearn. This assessment was carried out as part of the Housing Market Area (HMA) known as West Surrey which included Waverley and Woking in addition to Guildford.

2.6 The most recent population projections produced by Office of National Statistics (ONS) shows that by 2037, the population of Surrey is expected to increase by over 200,000. This increase is anticipated to be greater than shown by the 2012 population figures. The 2012 figures informed the SHMA which in turn has provided the basis around which the housing requirement for the new Local Plan is formed. It can be expected that a large proportion of this increase will be in the West Surrey HMA due to its proximity to London, strong rail connections and reputation as being part of the commuter belt and a desirable place to live. It is on this basis that we would question the validity of the figures and believe that the OAN to inaccurate and should be revised upwards taking into account the increases based on the 2014 projections as opposed to the 2012 figures. This should, in turn, mean that the housing requirements in the new Local Plan should also be revised upwards and the identification of other sites for development should be considered as part of this process.

Five-year supply of deliverable housing land

2.7 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that there is a requirement for Local Planning Authorities (LPA) to:

“Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5%....where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing, LPAs should increase the buffer to 20%”.

2.8 It has been established that GBC cannot demonstrate a robust five year supply of deliverable housing land and at best the Council can show 2.5 years supply whilst at worst this drops to 1.4 years. It is therefore clear that without significantly more available land, Guildford cannot expect to be able to show a five year supply. The NPPF para 83 states that “Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”. However, as the site is surrounded by development, and is in many respects an area of “washed over” Green Belt, we conclude that the site should be looked on favourably as a suitable development site in the 0-5 year time frame.

Housing requirements within new Local Plan (2013-2033)

2.9 The pre-submission version of the draft Local Plan makes provision for the delivery of 13,860 new homes over the plan period (2013-2033). This equates to 693 dwellings per annum which matches the identified housing need through the SHMA. The draft Local Plan states that:

“The delivery of new homes is expected to increase over the plan period, reflective of timescales associated with delivery of strategic sites”.
The draft Local Plan sets out the housing delivery in different tranches as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Number</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2026/2027</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2027/2028</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2028/2029</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2029/2030</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2030/2031</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/2024</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2031/2032</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/2025</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2032/2033</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/2026</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11 The above shows that there is proposed to be an increasing level of delivery over time as the plan progresses through the plan period. On this basis, to ensure the minimum housing requirements are achieved, over the first five years of the plan an average of 693 dwellings per annum are to be delivered. This raises an immediate concern given that GBC cannot demonstrate a five year land supply of any better than 2.5 years. As the net completions table also shows, the first two years of the plan period 2013/14 and 2014/15 have delivered significantly fewer than 693 dwellings per annum. Therefore it is vital that existing allocations in the draft Local Plan are retained and that those which are suitable and deliverable, particularly within the near future, such as the 120 deliverable units in allocation A40 at Waterloo Farm, remain within the Plan and are supported in coming forward as soon as possible within the 0-5 year time frame.

3.0 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE ALLOCATION

Horsley in Plan Making

3.1 The site was identified within the previous emerging Local Plan which was released in 2014. The site has been promoted throughout the development of the emerging Local Plan process and previous representations for this site were submitted in September 2014 as part of the Local Plan consultation under regulation 18 (attached as Appendix A for your information). In addition, the proposed development of part of the Site has been the subject of a formal Outline application submitted by Alliance Planning (now part of WYG) for 3 houses (reference 14/P/00012). This application was refused at the time for 4 reasons. Reason 1 was due to the site location, outside of any housing allocation and within the Green Belt, and is the subject of this and the previous representations. Reasons 2-4 relate to technical matters and developer contributions which could all be overcome in any future application submission.

3.2 Importantly, the refusal raised no issues in relation to:

- Highways and Transport
- Residential Amenity
- Mains Drainage and Utilities Provision
- Trees and Vegetation; or
- Ecology.

Senior Planning Officers (Policy) visited the site and walked the boundaries in March 2014. Details of discussions are included as part of Appendix C.

3.3 The emerging Local Plan, through the draft strategy and sites document, has allocated the land at Wisley Airfield for a mixed use development, including the provision of up to 2068 dwellings. The recently refused planning application (planning ref: 15/P/00012) has shown the difficulty in achieving a consent through a local decision and a reliance on a possible determination through appeal. This creates a great deal of uncertainty as to whether the anticipated housing as part of this proposed development can be delivered in a timely manner and therefore contribute to the Borough’s pressing needs.
housing need. Therefore the reliance on such a site should be limited. It is possible that up to 2100 dwellings may have to be delivered elsewhere in the borough. We recommend therefore that suitable nearby sites should be taken forward where there is a clear ability to deliver housing numbers. This would apply to the site at Ockham Road North. We therefore recommend that the Council should consider all sites that are considered suitable and deliverable and this particular site is one which meets these criteria. We strongly suggest the allocation should remain when taking the pre-submission plan to examination with the existing quantum of development as identified. If however, the Council decides not to allocate this wider site, the Waterloo Farm site should in any case be included in the settlement boundary, as it is already enclosed on all sides.

Access

3.4 There is a suitable road access to the site, which currently serves the Caravan site, Waterloo Farm and Lake and Shepherd Cottages, the additional traffic generation and pedestrian footfall for a small number of dwellings would not result in any transport concerns. The existing access/egress into the site is therefore considered to be appropriate. As part of the wider allocation, it is our understanding that suitable upgrades will be made to both the access road and the junction with Ockham Road North, where necessary to accommodate 120 units or the existing road would be suitable with minor improvement if the Waterloo Farm site only is allocated (included within the settlement boundary, excluded from the Green Belt).

Flood Risk

3.5 Previous concerns have been raised concerning flooding matters. The previous representation for the regulation 18 was accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment prepared by Peter Brett Associates see Appendix B. Persimmon Homes have conducted further extensive work regarding this aspect which has been submitted as part of their representation for the site, which concludes that:

“The modelling work also incorporated climate change allowances in line with newly released Environment Agency/DCLG guidance. This detailed modelling has clearly shown the Environment Agency’s mapped flood extents to be overestimating the actual scenario…”

Their modelling further demonstrates that suitable mitigation can be provided onsite to overcome this technical matter lowering the flood risk on the site and therefore the principle of development, and therefore a deliverable allocation on this site should be considered as appropriate, notwithstanding the previous refusal.

Sustainability

3.6 The site is located a short walk from the centre of Horsley and situated alongside existing residential development. The site represents a logical infilling of available land to the rear of Nightingale Avenue to the south. Para 14 of the NPPF states that a presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the heart of planning, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both planmaking and decision-taking. There is an existing wide footway running along Ockham Road North which provides a safe pedestrian route that is used by a large number of people to access the centre of east Horsley.

3.7 The settlement hierarchy, published in May 2014 and used as part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan, notes that East Horsley has a population of 3,785 (2011) and is ranked as the 3rd most sustainable location within the borough (out of 32). In addition to the highly rated sustainability of East Horsley, the site lies close to West Horsley which is ranked as the 13th most sustainable location within the borough (out of 32).

3.8 The site is located less than a mile away from the centre of East Horsley where many of the local facilities which can serve residents’ day-to-day needs are found. The main line rail station is also located close to the high street and this allows good access to London Waterloo via a train service which takes under an hour and includes stops at larger stations such as Leatherhead, Epsom, Wimbledon, Clapham Junction (east) and Guildford (west); allowing access to large employment areas and facilitating onward travel.

3.9 Raleigh Primary, Glenesk Preparatory and Montessori Nursery are within 1/2 mile radius. Cranmore Nursery and Preparatory is within 2 miles. These schools provide suitable education for children up to the age of 11 and secondary
school education is provided by Howard of Effingham and Manor School which are within 2 miles of the site in nearby Effingham. We note that Raleigh School is also within the draft allocation to be enlarged and relocated to Policy A41. This proposal is one of few infrastructure projects being considered as part of the plan and we are also in support of this much needed facility.

3.10 The Site lies on Ockham Road North exactly midway (some 2 miles) between direct access to the A3 etc and the A246 (Guildford /Leatherhead/Epsom). These two direct road access points ensure high sustainability of the site and allow further access on to the M25 road network which links to Heathrow and Gatwick airports in addition to the wider national strategic road network through the M3, M4 and M40 motorways. This allows for the development to have a suitable mix of transport options through either using the strategic road network or utilising the train line. Access to the train line is provided by a wide footway and the road from the site down into East Horsley is 30 mph and is considered to be safe for all to use. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) states that there are to be additional highway improvements made within the West and East Horsley areas through a traffic management and environmental improvement scheme which is to planned to be delivered between 2019 and 2023. This would further enhance the highway safety with the local area through traffic calming measures as well as ensuring the character of the two areas remains as present.

3.11 The development of this small part of site A40 for several units would not require the highway works to competed first, as such this section of the site should be considered as deliverable within the 0-5 year time frame. For the wider site there would be the opportunity to contribute to the traffic calming measures by extending the existing 30mph speed limit past the site access.

Landscape and Visual Assessment

3.12 The Site comprises an area of residential garden surrounded by trees and dense landscaping on all sides, with residential dwellings beyond on the south. The site is away from public rights of way and as discussed within the Regulation 18 representation, Officers walked the site and found it to be secluded with very few views in or out. Therefore the Site is considered to have low landscape impact and it does not contribute to the wider open landscape value of the Green Belt. This is further supported by the councils separate proposal to remove this area from the Green Belt altogether.

3.13 The Site, having an overall low landscape sensitivity and a low landscape value, is considered to have a high capacity to successfully accommodate residential development, particularly that of 2 – 2.5 storey residential development, sensitively designed through siting, layout and massing, set within the existing woodland buffer, complemented by a comprehensive landscape framework and green infrastructure proposals, resulting in very limited landscape and visual effects on the surrounding area, including the Green Belt. It should also be noted that a strip of land within this allocation is within the designated settlement boundary.

3.14 The combination of the low landscape character sensitivity and low visual sensitivity, result in low overall landscape sensitivity for the Site.

Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)

3.15 The Site falls within the 5km buffer zone of the TBH SPA at Ockham and Wisley Common and therefore, in line with saved policy NRM6 of the South East Plan, it is necessary to provide suitable mitigation for the proposed development. For this section of the allocation, if brought forward on its own, it would likely fall within the thresholds for a financial contribution to be provided as part of the development. Alternatively SANG may be provided onsite as part of the wider A40 allocation.

Density of Development

3.16 The overall allocation of A40 is 8 ha (some 20 acres). At 120 dwellings this would suggest a density of 15 per ha / 6 per acre. This would allow for a relatively low density so as not to result in the “over development” of the villages or a strain on services.
3.17 The Councils LAA February 2016 identifies the sire as REF975: This document concludes that the side is acceptable in all respects subject to drainage having being relocated; the previous PBA report and attached PBA reports demonstrate acceptability in the respect

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion

4.1 In conclusion, Site Allocation A40 represents the opportunity for a sustainable extension to what is one of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough of Guildford, and indeed is regarded as the most sustainable of the villages outside the urban areas of Guildford, Ash and Tongham. It is well connected to the existing community and facilities which will remain accessible to prospective residents. The increase in population that results from this extension to the physical extent of the village also helps to support the continued viability of local services.

4.2 It has been demonstrated in this submission that the site is suitable for the development proposed as it is directly adjacent to and bound by existing areas of housing. The proposals would consolidate the form of the settlement in this location which would result in a less dispersed pattern of development than exists at present to the north of the main service centre at East Horsley. New development on this site would be fully contained both within the site itself and within the perceived extent of the village which lies further to the south. The Development in this location would not encroach into wider more open areas of the Green Belt further from the village. The plan also identifies the site as inset from the Green Belt, further supporting the case for the development of the site.

4.3 Housing development would be compatible with the surrounding land uses which are well-established and enclose our site. These include areas of housing to the north, east and south, and the Camping and Caravanning Club of Great Britain site to the west.

4.4 A summary of the benefits of the site are below:

- This site will provide several residential units in the Waterloo Farm part of the site with a total of 120 units across the allocation within a sustainable location.
- The settlement of East Horsley is an appropriate location for additional housing and is among the best performing villages in the Borough in terms of their sustainability credentials and in terms of the access these provide to local services.
- The proposed uses would be compatible with adjacent land uses.
- The site is well-contained and enclosed by existing physical features and development, forming a natural extension of and would be contiguous with the residential environment of the settlements of East Horsley and West Horsley.
- The site has defensible boundaries which will ensure that the development will not harm the purpose or openness of the wider Green Belt or landscape value.
- The site is not constrained by any other sensitive planning designations.
- The site would not impact materially on any existing residential properties.
- The site is deliverable within 1 – 5 years, there being no insurmountable obstacles or technical issues to delivery in terms of highway, drainage, SPA or the capacity of existing utilities.
- The scheme will generate section 106 contributions and provide SANG mitigation.

4.5 The site should be allocated as the wider site A40, or if not, Waterloo Farm as a further inset from the Green Belt in this part of Horsley.

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

Attached documents:
- A098810 Appendix B FRA.pdf (1.9 MB)
- A098810 Appendix A Regulation 18 reps Chris Roe.pdf (2.2 MB)
As new resident with a 19 month year I child I write with great concern regarding the site proposals within the West and East Horsley green belt.

The Waterloo Farm site would back straight on to our family home and the density of new houses would quite literally damage the quality of living we have worked so hard to create.

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

Attached documents:
We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

There is a history of some sewer flooding. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.

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

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

Document part: A41 - Land to the south of West Horsley
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4016  
**Respondent:** 8556673 / Andrew French  
**Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

I also have a particular concern about site A41 because of its prominence and its contribution to the Green Belt setting of the village. This site was added in the current consultation and is the most unsuitable of all the proposed village sites by virtue of its location.

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

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7412  
**Respondent:** 8557761 / Nigel Farley  
**Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**Site Allocation A41**

1. **At no stage in the previous draft Local Plan process and subsequent consultation did this site appear for consideration, now suddenly it has been included in the present draft Local Plan Strategy & Sites increasing the development burden within West Horsley.**

2. The site to the south of East Lane, adjoining Lollesworth Lane is an important green space to be viewed and enjoyed when traversing East Lane in either direction.

3. This site is unsustainable and unsuitable for the proposed density of development due in part to its green belt status; in part to infrastructure fragility and incapacity (drainage and road surfaces - both of which are already failing due to lack of ongoing investment to improve capacity)

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

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7918  
**Respondent:** 8563201 / West Horsley Parish Council (Sam Pinder)  
**Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

**Sites Policies A37 to A41**

**Report page:** 18

**WHPC view:** Objects strongly
In brief: All the West Horsley Sites are unsustainable, as demonstrated in the Planning Assessment Report (Appendix 2) when evaluated against NPPF Policies.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8276  Respondent: 8566497 / Derek Horne & Associates Ltd (Derek Horne)  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A41, Land adjacent to South of West Horsley  
This is a rural Green Belt site unrelated to any significant development and remote from shops and public transport. It is an unsustainable site on which unsustainable development is proposed contrary to government advice as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. If such a scale of development is necessary, which is disputed, there are several much better sites in the area that should be considered.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4300  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A41 Land to south of West Horsley  
186. I object to this site being included. Guildford Borough Council have proposed moving the settlement boundary and insetting the enlarged village in order to allow a development for which there are no exceptional circumstances. This is a very obvious intrusion into the openness of the Green Belt.

187. Strangely, the "opportunities" include "Green Corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site" when the proposal represents a major reduction in these features.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4301  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Sites A36 to A41- general reasons for objection

---
188. These sites and some smaller sites identified with densities that are very much higher than, and out of proportion with, the nature of this locality represent a massive increase in the population of The Horsleys and will destroy their character. Further development in the form of infilling and inappropriate development will take place as a result of the proposed insetting.

189. No genuine consideration has been given to the traffic impacts (the baseline traffic flows modelled for this area were severely understated) or adequacy of local services to support this growth. Public transport is very poor and these sites will generate a large volume of additional car journeys on roads that already have queuing. The site proposals are unsustainable.

190. The Infrastructure Development Plan largely ignores this area of the Borough with a token £1m added at the last minute, apparently as an afterthought, for an "East Horsley and West Horsley traffic management and environmental improvement scheme". Residents have been given no indication as to what this entails and I suspect that it has been given no real consideration. Residents have no idea whether the scheme will be acceptable in terms of any undesirable impacts that it might have or whether it will be effective.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5166  Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

I support the removal of this site. It is inappropriate for development.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5673  Respondent: 8580225 / planit consulting (janet long)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016

Site A41 – Land South of West Horsley

SUPPORT FOR LAND ALLOCATION

It is considered the site allocation meets the requirement of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) in that the Council undertook a Land Availability Assessment (LAA) which assessed land available for housing development. The LAA assessed sites in terms of suitability and sustainability. Site (A41) was identified as part of that exercise, and therefore was fully explored in terms of its suitability. The assessment and ultimate inclusion in the LAA 2016 illustrates that the site is suitably located for development.

In terms of availability, the land is open grass land with no impediment to development. Furthermore, in terms of ownership it is immediately available and in this respect also meets the requirements of NPPG.
It is recognised that the site lies outside the identified West Horsley settlement boundary and within the Green Belt. However, within the Councils ‘Green Belt and Countryside Study’ the site is identified as a potential development area under reference C14-D. The findings of the study indicate that the land scores ‘One’ against the purposes of the Green Belt. Accordingly Volume 4 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study suggests that this land could be inset from the Green Belt.

The site is categorised in the Landscape Character Assessment as falling within Rural Character Area E2 – ‘Wooded Rolling Claylands’. This requires that new development needs to respect the landscape and townscape character and local distinctiveness of the area. Given the allocated site area of 4.8 hectares, there will be sufficient space to develop the land for both housing whilst also providing sufficient landscaping, (tree and shrub planting) appropriate to the identified character area.

In all respects I support this proposal as Site A41 is able to meet all the requirements of the NPPG in respect of allocations and, can be appropriately developed to meet the Councils identified housing shortfall.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;documents attached&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents: ![Policy A41 v2.pdf](252 KB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6307</th>
<th>Respondent: 8605537 / Mr Philip Stone</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART 2 - SITES : SITES A38 AND A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased to attach comments submitted in respect of the above and the relocation of the Raleigh School, West Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents: ![Raleigh School - Location Plan.pdf](1.6 MB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Raleigh School - Response to GBC 15072016.pdf](2.8 MB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Raleigh School - A41 Conceptual Master Plan.pdf](1.5 MB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/907</th>
<th>Respondent: 8659489 / Helen Bennett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is entirely wrong for building. It is plainly open field, with no adjacent building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7717</th>
<th>Respondent: 8717921 / Helen Jeffries</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the allocation of land at East Lane, WH – allocation A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1210  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2177  Respondent: 8774113 / Ian Elliott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

The removal of the site A41 which would have been used as a sustainable location for a new school is short sighted and indicates that the council have little feel for the needs of local people. In turn the development of the present school site would have alleviated the pressure on other more contentious sites.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2227  Respondent: 8797665 / Sylvia Lillywhite  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

A41 The removal of this site from the revised local plan is short sighted to say the least.

The site A41 was given to the school to build a school fit for purpose, at the moment there are approx 430 pupils in a school build for 200 max children with 18 in a class currently there are 32 in each class almost double.

A waiting list of 96 currently.

The outdoor area is totally insufficient for 430 children.

Sports facilities in the school are just not viable on safety grounds.

Quality of life in classrooms in hot/cold weather is unacceptable.

Windows are single glazed in upstairs rooms, already a bird flew into one and the glass smashed..not acceptable.
The parking is inadequate and causes problems between the school and residents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4617  Respondent: 8817153 / Paul Ives  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

We agree with the decision to omit this policy from the Draft Local Plan. This is an area of unspoilt agricultural land.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1515  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

Again, traffic congestion and road safety are of major concern given that an additional 90 houses will produce somewhere in the region of 200+ cars. East Lane (where this site is situated) is a tight two-lane road that was built for the pony & trap /stage coach era but which already carried a significant volume of traffic with people turning off the Ockham Road and/or the Drift into East Lane to go to The Raleigh School and/or make their way towards Guildford and other environs. The fact that The Raleigh School is served by East Lane means that some young children make their way to school on bikes I scooters etc and any additional cars will only increase the risk of tragic accidents. The village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for expansion. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. For the above reasons, I OBJECT to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2066  Respondent: 8832513 / Richard Russell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

Site A41: Adjoining East Lane, West Horsley: (90 houses)

Again, traffic congestion and road safety are of major concern given that an additional 90 houses will produce somewhere in the region of 200+ cars. East Lane (where this site is situated) is a tight two-lane road that was built for the pony & trap /stage coach era but which already carried a significant volume of traffic with people turning off the Ockham Road and/or the Drift into East Lane to go to The Raleigh School and/or make their way towards Guildford and other environs. The
fact that The Raleigh School is served by East Lane means that some young children make their way to school on bikes/scooters etc and any additional cars will only increase the risk of tragic accidents. The village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for expansion. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. For the above reasons, I OBJECT to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2576</th>
<th>Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara</th>
<th>Agent: Portal Planning (John Bowles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUILDFORD BOROUGH PROPOSED SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN: STRATEGY AND SITES 2016
REPRESENTATIONS BY MR M O'HARA AND RESIDENTS OF WEST HORSLEY

I am instructed by the following residents of West Horsley to OBJECT to the proposed site allocation under Policy A41: Land to the South of West Horsley:

- Mr Martin O’Hara & Mrs Janet O’Hara [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mr Julian Colborne-Baber & Mrs Clare Colborne-Baber [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mr Robert Beale & Mrs Clodagh Beale [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mr Richard Wills & Mrs Jenny Wills [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mr Paul Douet & Mrs Nicola Douet [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mrs Patricia Rutter [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]
- Mr Peter Edwards & Mrs Debra Edwards [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998]

The above all reside in West Horsley in very close proximity to the proposed site allocation.

Basis of Objection

The inclusion of the proposed allocation of the land to the south of West Horsley under Policy A41 is unsound.

A Local Plan may only be adopted if it is sound. As a matter of government policy, soundness requires a plan to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy[1]. Within these four heads it should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’) and be deliverable over its period.

Consistency with National Policy

The site is presently situated within established Green Belt. The policy on protection for the Green Belt is contained in section 9 of the NPPF, which sets out the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy:
79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

([1] National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 182)

Policy on development in Metropolitan Green Belt is set out at paragraphs 79 – 92 of the National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’). Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt and the NPPF states that it “should not be approved except in very special circumstances” (paragraph 87). Local planning authorities are advised to “regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt” (paragraph 89).

Although it is possible for a local planning authority to conduct a review of Green Belt land and consider redefining boundaries which add or take away Green Belt land in order to meet local planning requirements, paragraph 83 of the NPPF states:

83. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

The paragraph above sets out that a Green Belt review should only happen in “exceptional circumstances”. This concept is further elaborated on in paragraph 82 as being “for example when planning for larger scale development such as new settlements or major urban extensions”.

As the Green Belt in Surrey is established with detailed boundaries, “exceptional circumstances” must be demonstrated to necessitate the change to its boundaries[2]. It is self-evident that a development plan review is not an exceptional circumstance. Paragraph 84 of the NPPF advises:

84. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channeling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.

The NPPF therefore requires site allocations to be sustainable development, as defined in the NPPF, capable of being carried out in practical terms and, in the Green Belt, justified by exceptional circumstances. For the reasons set out below, we are of the opinion that the allocation of this site under Policy A41 is not sustainable development and is not justified by exceptional circumstances. We are also of the opinion that the removal of the adjoining field and part of Lollesworth Wood from the Green belt is also not justified by exceptional circumstances.

Justification

In March 2014 the Government published new web-based Planning Practice Guidance to accompany and give further detail about the policies in the NPPF. This guidance sets out that unmet housing need in a particular area is unlikely to meet the “very special circumstances” test to justify Green Belt development:

Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt[3].

On 4 October 2014 the former Government announced that it had updated its online Planning Practice Guidance. The aim of this was to reaffirm local authorities’ abilities to “safeguard their local area against urban sprawl, and protect the green lungs around towns and cities”. The then Government said that it wanted to make planning policy clear that housing need does not justify the harm done to the Green Belt by inappropriate development. The new guidance reads:

Do housing and economic needs override constraints on the use of land, such as green belt?

The National Planning Policy Framework should be read as a whole: need alone is not the only factor to be considered when drawing up a Local Plan.

The Framework is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted. Such policies include those relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, and/or designated as sites of special scientific interest; land designated as Green Belt, local green space, an area of outstanding natural beauty, heritage coast or within a national park or the Broads; designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.

The Framework makes clear that, once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.

Do local planning authorities have to meet in full housing needs identified in needs assessments?

Local authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs.

However, assessing need is just the first stage in developing a Local Plan. Once need has been assessed, the local planning authority should prepare a strategic housing land availability assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period, and in so doing take account of any constraints such as Green Belt, which indicate that development should be restricted and which may restrain the ability of an authority to meet its need.

In December 2014 the Planning Minister, Brandon Lewis, wrote to the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate about strategic housing market assessments. This letter set out the relationship between housing figures produced as part of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and those in a Local Plan and how to take into account constraints such as Green Belt land:

“However, the outcome of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment is untested and should not automatically be seen as a proxy for a final housing requirement in Local Plans. It does not immediately or in itself invalidate housing numbers in existing Local Plans.

Councils will need to consider Strategic Housing Market Assessment evidence carefully and take adequate time to consider whether there are environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement. They also need to consider whether there are opportunities to co-operate with neighboring planning authorities to meet needs across housing market areas. Only after these considerations are complete will the council’s approach be tested at examination by an Inspector. Clearly each council will need to work through this process to take account of particular local circumstances in responding to Strategic Housing Market Assessments[4].”

The overall extent of development required in the borough necessary to meet the employment and housing needs in the borough as set out at Policy S2 has not been satisfactorily defined having regard to the methodology summarised above.

The West Surrey Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) assesses an Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) of 693 dwellings per annum “but does not take into account land supply, policy or other constraints to development” (paragraph 1.2, Guildford Summary Report – October 2015). This figure is acknowledged as

(4) Letter from Brandon Lewis to the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate about strategic housing market assessments, 19 December 2014)
including upwards adjustments to support growth in student numbers and higher migration levels than are shown in the 2012-based Population Projections and represents an OAN 23% higher than the need calculated through London sensitivity analysis (paragraphs 4.1 – 4.2, Guildford Summary Report – October 2015).

Policy S2 of the Draft Local Plan applies uncritically this OAN figure to identify a housing requirement of 13,860 dwellings for the plan period (20 years @ 693 dpa). There is no evidence to indicate that in defining this figure the Council has undertaken a careful consideration of “whether there are environmental and policy constraints, such as Green Belt, which will impact on their overall final housing requirement” and which indicate that development should be restricted. The Proposed Submission Local Plan’s proposal to make provision for 62% of this total dwelling requirement on land that is currently Green Belt is not supported by adequate justification. An full explanation should be provided of the methodology used and process undertaken by the Council to reach its housing requirement figure and why the OAN figure has not been moderated in light of a ‘careful consideration’ of the constraints applying in the district.

The burden of meeting what the Council has defined as its development needs is proposed to fall disproportionately on the rural east of the borough. Within this area, West Horsley is allocated to bear an excessive proportion of this development, despite the countervailing reasons put forward in previous consultation rounds by many local residents (e.g. narrow roads; areas of flood risk; access to school places and medical facilities; parking availability at the stations etc.).

The proposed allocation of this site for 90 homes is in addition to 3 other sites proposed for allocation in West Horsley (under Policies A37, A38 and A40). In total, if all four allocations are confirmed, the total number of new houses proposed in West Horsley is 385 homes – a significant addition to the existing village.

Additionally, there are a further 100 homes proposed on the fields behind Ockham Road North and Heatherdene up to Lollesworth Wood (Policy A39) in East Horsley.

Whilst my clients are not opposed to new houses in West Horsley per se, this scale of potential development in West Horsley is excessive and is not supported by the Guildford Borough Economic Strategy 2013 – 2031. West Horsley is remote from the existing centres of employment and the new Economic Development Site proposals which are focussed on the opposite side of the Borough.

Additional Points of Objection

1. The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this location resulting from the allocation of the site does not have sufficient regard to its intended permanence in the long term or its capability of enduring beyond the plan period (contrary to NPPF paragraph 83)

If the allocation of this site under Policy A41 is adopted, the prospect of further infilling and extension of the settlement on adjacent undeveloped sites south of East Lane and north of Lollesworth Wood will significantly increase, further harming the Green Belt and the purposes for which it has been designated in this area. Development would result in greater risk of encroachment and coalescence between West Horsley (North) and West Horsley (South) and harm to the existing character of the village.

The proposed revision to the Green Belt boundary in this location has been poorly considered and has not been clearly defined using “physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent” contrary to the guidance at NPPF paragraph 85. In addition, the removal of the adjacent field and part of Lollesworth Wood to the south of the Policy A41 site from the Green Belt is not justified by exceptional circumstances.

Allocation of the site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” and the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in significant detriment to the village’s character and harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCI (contrary to Sustainability Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the GBLP Sustainability Appraisal)

2. The assessment of sensitivity in the context of the five purposes of Green Belt set out in the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group (see Evidence Base), on which the proposed removal of the Policy A41 site from the Green Belt is based, is flawed. The land parcels used to assess sensitivity are ill-considered and mask significant variations in function and character of different areas within each land parcel. As a consequence, the
conclusions drawn are subjective and inconsistent and do not provide a robust basis from which objective decisions can be made. This is reflected in inconsistent conclusions about the extent to which different land parcels fulfil Green Belt purposes as set out in the Sensitivity Table.

3. The parish of West Horsley’s open, semi-rural, character makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt in this part of the parish. This is a specific and differentiating characteristic of West Horsley over its neighbour, East Horsley, which the Council has failed to recognise.

This rural landscape character is highly valued by West Horsley residents and is detailed in general terms within the Guildford Borough Council Landscape Character Assessment. In many ways the character of West Horsley is defined by the open views from the roads either entering or passing through the village settlement.

Upon entering the village from any direction roads such as Ockham Road North, Long Reach, Ripley Lane and (to a lesser degree) Shere Road have a clearly defined precedent of the settlement being on one side of the route and there being open vistas across fields/meadows/farmland or into woodlands on the other.

No less important to the village character, however, is the fact that the main vehicular traffic route through the village (along East Lane/The Street) currently benefits from a ‘green gap’ to the north between The Rectory (approximately opposite Northcote Road) to Grovelands Farm (beyond the railway bridge) and to the south between Roundtree Farm and the Railway Cottages (at the railway bridge). This area, centred on the Lollesworth Lane/Long Reach junction, is in many ways the ‘heart and lungs’ of the village.

Allocation of this site is completely counter to the wishes of the West Horsley residents. Its value is confirmed following the West Horsley Household Survey April 2015, whereby 615 village households (out of 1121 households) returned questionnaire results. The survey identified the following consistent strong opinion:

- 95.55% agreed or strongly agreed (87.68% strongly agreed / 8.27% agreed) that West Horsley should retain its rural character, defined by open spaces, parkland and green space.
- 92.15% agreed or strongly agreed (80.22% strongly agreed / 11.93% agreed) that West Horsley should retain the open aspect and strategic natural spaces along East Lane, The Street, Ripley Lane, Epsom Road and Long Reach, which reinforce the village’s rural nature.

The findings of the West Horsley Household Survey April 2015 are being used to inform the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for West Horsley (the West Horsley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has appointed rCOH to assist on working up the Neighbourhood Plan).

This site is essential to the village’s rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open aspect is maintained through what is, in effect, the centre of the village. If adopted, Policy A41 would allow this open space to become the only development (existing or proposed) of any significant depth along the whole of the southern side of the East Lane/The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley, contrary to at least 2 of the 5 essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely, to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – functions which this part of the Green Belt, including the site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 in the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study).

Development of the site will not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built development and the surrounding landscape, and will harm important views of the village from the surrounding landscape and from within the village of local landmarks, contrary to Policy D4 of the Draft Local Plan.

4. This site has not previously been included as a Potential Development Site (PDS) within previous draft versions of the emerging Local Plan and assessment of the site in background studies forming the evidence base for this allocation is based on factually incorrect information. In particular:
In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – ‘Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary’. This is incorrect. The site does not abut the 2003 defined Village settlement boundary at all.

The Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that the Council now propose removing from the Green Belt (together with a section of Lollesworth Wood) as site D. All the assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway station presume that access can be gained to Lollesworth Lane via the (undesignated) field to the south fronting Lollesworth Lane. This field (used for grazing sheep) is owned by one of my clients (Mr & Mrs Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm) who advise that they would permit no access route across their field.

5. There is insufficient infrastructure capacity to accommodate the allocation of this site, in addition to the other sites proposed for allocation in West Horsley (north) and East Horsley. In particular, there is insufficient capacity both at junior (The Raleigh) and senior (The Howard of Effingham) school level. The Raleigh has recently indicated to local residents that it cannot further increase capacity on its existing site and is considering relocating, raising further concern about potential erosion and harm to the Green Belt.

The Horsley Doctors Surgery is already at capacity. The existing utilities infrastructure in the area would be further stretched, probably beyond acceptable limits. Water pressure in the area is already poor and surface water drainage along East Lane is a continual problem throughout the autumn and winter months. The addition of further built environment and associated hard landscaping south of East Lane would only exacerbate the problem. Indeed, as referenced in the Land Availability Assessment (see Evidence Base), Thames Water have commented that the current wastewater network in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. The Draft Guildford Borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 also identifies a significant Surface Water Flooding hotspot in and around West Horsley. Without the preparation of a drainage strategy to determine the exact impact on the infrastructure and the significance of the infrastructure to support the development, the deliverability of housing on this site is unclear.

Conclusion and Request for Amendment

The inclusion of the proposed allocation of the land to the south of West Horsley under Policy A41 is unsound in that, having regard to the advice at paragraph 182 of the NPPF it is neither consistent with national policy nor justified. I therefore request, on behalf of my clients, the removal of this proposed allocation site from the Local Plan and the retention of this site and the adjoining field and part of Lollesworth Wood within the Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3902</th>
<th>Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular I would like to STRONGLY OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41: Land to the south of West Horsley.
The Policy A41 site is, in my opinion, essential to the village’s semi-rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open green aspect is maintained through what is, in so many ways, the centre of the village.

If the Proposed Local Plan is adopted, Policy A41 would allow this open space to become the only development (existing or proposed) of any significant depth along the whole of the entire southern side of the East Lane / The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley. Any development on this land would fundamentally change the character of the village and be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. At no point does it adjoin the current village settlement boundary, as defined in the 2003 Local Plan and it is, in no way, a natural extension of the village’s current built environment and sticks out like a wart or carbuncle into the otherwise protected landscape.

Any development on this site would not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape (i.e. development on one side of the route only). In my opinion, it will also harm important views of the village from surrounding landscape (from Lollesworth Lane) and from within the village of local landmarks (of Lollesworth Wood), contrary to Policy D4 of the Proposed Local Plan.

Furthermore, the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group states in paragraph 13.15 “For a village to be potentially inset within the Green Belt it would need to be demonstrated that recognisable, defensible and permanent Green Belt boundaries could be provided that would ensure they are retained in the long term.” I do not believe that such real boundaries have been identified or used in respect of this site allocation under Policy A41.

The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary in this location, resulting from the allocation of the site, does not therefore potentially have sufficient regard to its intended permanence in the long term or its capacity of enduring beyond the plan period. Indeed, in my opinion it is contrary to NPPF paragraph 83 and contrary to the guidance of NPPF paragraph 85, as it has not been clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In my opinion, the proposed revision to the Green Belt boundary in this location has been very poorly considered.

If the allocation of this site is adopted, the prospect of further infilling and extension of the village settlement defined in the 2003 Local Plan on adjacent undeveloped, but currently protected, sites south of East Lane and north of Lollesworth Wood would significantly increase, raising the spectre of further subsequent harm to the Green Belt and the purposes for which it has been designated in this area. Development of any nature in this location would result in the greater risk of encroachment and coalescence between the two built settlements in West Horsley and would fundamentally harm to the existing open and natural character of the village.

This is clearly contrary to at least two of the five essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment); functions which this part of the Green Belt, including this site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 of the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group.

The proposed allocation of this site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” as most potential residents, if this site were to be developed, would not walk the mile or so to the local facilities (shops / doctors / station etc.) in East Horsley and would further add to the traffic issues in the vicinity.

In addition, the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in a significant detriment to the village’s biodiversity and natural character. This site is immediately adjoining the Lollesworth Wood SNCI.

GBC’s own Proposed Local Plan Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure; states that “Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.” Local Sites are earlier defined in the policy as including such Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).
Such a proposal will inevitably cause harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCI. Indeed, this proposal is, in my opinion, contrary to Sustainability Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the Guildford borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal.

Finally, I would advise that the assessment of this site, in at least two background studies forming the evidence base for this Site Allocation, is based on incorrect information.

In particular:

1. In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane’) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – “Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary”. This is incorrect. As previously stated, and unlike any of the other three sites proposed in West Horsley, this site currently has no boundary that adjoins the village settlement boundary as defined in the GBC Local Plan 2003.

2. Also, the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that GBC now propose removing from the Green Belt together with a section of Lollesworth Wood, as site D. All assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway Station are presuming that access could have been gained to Lollesworth Lane via the undesignated (save that it has been proposed to be removed from the Green Belt) field to the south and fronting Lollesworth Lane. This field is currently used for grazing sheep and is owned by Mr & Mrs. Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm and they have advised me and others that they would not permit such access route across their field, therefore the assumption used by Pegasus Planning Group is incorrect, which should have a material effect on their conclusions and lead me to believe that their sustainability conclusions are, at best, suspect.

I would therefore specifically OBJECT to the amendment of the Green Belt boundary in this area, to both the site encompassed by Policy A41 and to the field and wood beyond Policy A41 site, whereby an adjacent field and part of the Lollesworth Wood (SNCI & Ancient Wood designated) to the south, beyond the site allocated under Policy A41, have also been removed from the Green Belt.

I genuinely cannot think of any reason for this amendment, save for as a potential second phase development and surely it cannot be considered to be justified by “exceptional circumstances” when no alternative use is currently proposed and its current and historic use is as pasture?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3905  Respondent: 8835425 / Martin O'Hara  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I believe that the inclusion of the proposed allocation of land to the south of West Horsley under Policy A41 is unsound. Allocation of this specific site and its Policy is neither consistent with national policy, nor is it justified. I believe therefore that this proposed allocation site be removed from the Local Plan and that it be returned to the protection offer by its Green Belt designation. I do not believe that the case for “exceptional circumstances” has been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here, or indeed in many other locations in and around the borough.

Furthermore, I believe that the proposed removal of the field and part of Lollesworth Wood to the south of the above site from the Green Belt should also be reconsidered and returned to the protection offered by its current Green Belt designation. I do not believe that the case for “exceptional circumstances” has in any way been proven for the proposed change in Green Belt boundary here either.
Attn. Planning Policy Team, Guildford Borough Council

Further to your letter, dated 7th June 2017, inviting me to take part in the targeted consultation on Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites (2017), I am writing to you in SUPPORT of the specific proposed change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan relating to the deletion of the previously proposed Policy A41.

I am pleased to note that the site, previously indicated for housing under Policy A41, has now been removed from the housing sites allocation and now remains within the protection of the Green Belt designation. May I take this opportunity to express my thanks for your decision to remove the threat of a built development and ‘return’ this important natural area of West Horsley to the protection of the Green Belt area. I trust that it can now rightly remain a most important contributor to the essential open character of the village.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7629  Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke  Agent:

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

1. Policy A41 (West Horsley) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of West Horsley

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2655  Respondent: 8839297 / David Mackay  Agent:

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

The removal of this site from the plan is to be welcomed as its possible future use for a relocated and enlarged primary school would represent a better use of the land than yet more housing and address my reservations regarding the level of primary school provision in the area. However, I assume the existing school site would then be used for housing, offsetting partially or entirely the housing removed from the plan by deleting this site. The removal of this site from the
plan will not therefore result in a reduction in the adverse impact of the plan on the roads, medical facilities, shop and station parking in West and East Horsley.

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

I would like to see the removal of this site accompanied by the removal of one of the other sites in West Horsley (A38 or A40) to achieve a genuine reduction in the amount of extra housing imposed on the area.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8134  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I OBJECT to policy A41 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

There are no exceptional circumstances proven

I STRONGLY OBJECT on the grounds that the boundary of this site totally fails to comply with the defensible boundary requirements set out in NPPF paragraph 85, and in the Green Belt and Countryside Study

This is a very last minute site not included in the regulation 18 consultation. This is a perverse inclusion being late and clearly not strategically aligned to defendable green belt boundaries set out in paragraph 85 of the NPPF. The site is included in the new proposed settlement by deviating, for no planning or logical reasons, the permanent and defendable green belt boundary of East Lane into an open field, following some hedges and trees only for it to return to the same boundary of East lane some 100m further along. The only logical and defendable boundary is the continuation of east lane to the Street/Long reach without deviation of it. A41 passes all the test of the Green belt as does the land on 3 sides of it which are proposed to remain in the Green Belt and outside the Village boundary. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site to be proposed for 90 houses and the green belt and village boundary should not be changed to incorporate it. This site, whatever, is planned on it should be removed from the village and remain in the Green Belt and outside the village boundary as defined by that part of east Lane consistent the defensible boundary requirements set out in NPPF paragraph 85, and in the Green Belt and Countryside Study.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8256  Respondent: 8843361 / Adrian Atkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I OBJECT to policy A41 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for building on this site and therefore development here does not meet paragraphs 87-89 of the NPPF.
I object to the proposed increasing of the number of development sites in West Horsley with the suggested inclusion of the 2 sites relating to the Raleigh School; current main site of the school and the playing fields of Western Lee. This is a developer led speculative proposition to shoehorn the carbuncle of a site that is site 41 into the plan based upon the enabling development of a new School. If the school was to be moved it can be financially accommodated without the need for 20+ houses and a sportshall (described as a community hall but the plan will be that it is privately owned) on site 41. It is greed not need that is driving this suggestion. There are rumours that additional houses will be proposed on site A38. The two current sites can be developed by Surrey CC, who own the sites, a piece of land can be bought and a new school can be built out of the proceeds if a need for that to happen can be identified by SCC. There is no need to tie the suggested need to a development deal involving two land owners

General objection for Sites A36-41 (East and West Horsley). It is perverse for exceptional circumstances to be claimed to destroy the character of ancient villages, the home of Sir Walter Raleigh, to create a mega-village at the very frontier of the perpetual Metropolitan Green belt, whereas, Ash and Tongham, at the other end of the borough beyond the London green belts is actually getting its own brand new green belt under Policy P3 using the total opposite exceptional circumstance. This is wrong.

The 6 and possibly 8 (if the council think the opportunistic Raleigh School development is progressed) Horsley sites should not be considered individually but the areas should be looked at on the basis of cumulative impact on the contiguous villages of East and West Horsley.

Building 533+ new houses on these 6 or 8 sites, plus at least another 90 on small sites is disproportionate relative to the rest of the borough and is totally out of character for West Horsley. It will destroy the rural character of this community.

The plan needs to be balanced, something the Council Leader is at pains to reiterate at every opportunity. Under this “balanced” plan, rural West Horsley will increase in size by over 35%. Whereas the area where the new green belt will go and the home of the council leader, Ash and Tongham will only get 16% and Guildford urban area only 11%. This is not balanced, not by any perverse interpretation of the word. The plan has to be sustainable, balancing out economic, environmental and Social requirements of the borough in accordance with Paragraph 7 of the NPPF. In the relation to West Horsley this is being brushed aside for disproportionate development. Urban and beyond the green belt are being spared inflated development at the expense of protected greenbelt such as West Horsley.

These sites will put unsustainable strain on local facilities and infrastructure, including public transport, parking, medical facilities, sewage, surface drainage and shops.

The harmful impact of these sites is magnified by the proximity of the so-called Wisley Airfield site (Three Farms Meadow), with 2,100 new homes only 2 miles away (see below).

The density of new housing on the 6 or 8 Horsley sites is inappropriate and out of keeping with the locality and against the NPPF

Sites situated on the edge of existing development in West Horsley encroach on surrounding open fields and require the extension of settlement boundaries for which the plan presents no arguments. Contrary to NPPF paragraph 79, this will contribute to creeping urbanisation by attenuating the Green Belt corridors separating the Horsleys from neighbouring settlements.

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

Attached documents:
West Horsley has specific and differentiating characteristics from East Horsley in that it benefits from a semi-rural nature and the loss to development of the sites being considered would change the village’s characteristics forever. I particularly STRONGLY OBJECT to the addition of a new proposed site for 90 homes on land to the south of West Horsley (Policy A41) which is along East Lane, in completely rural surroundings. Throughout West Horsley, one of the defining characteristics of the village is that where there is settlement on one side of the road, there are green fields or woods or open spaces on the other side, thereby giving the village its rural nature. The site covered by Policy A41 is inconsistent with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the nature of the village of West Horsley. It does not adjoin any existing Local Plan 2003 settlement boundary and would seriously affect the rural character of the main arterial route through the village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2126  Respondent: 8878241 / Janet O'Hara  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

Further to your letter of 7 June 2017 inviting me to take part in the targeted consultation on Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites (2017), I am writing to you in SUPPORT of the specific proposed change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan relating to the deletion of the previously proposed Policy A41.

Although previously indicated for housing under Policy A41, I am now very pleased to see that the site has now been removed from the housing sites allocation and now remains within the protection of the Green Belt designation. I would like to thank you for your decision to remove the threat of a built development and to keep this important natural area of West Horsley within the protection of the Green Belt area. I trust that it can now remain as one of the key areas that remind us of the open and rural character of West Horsley, which is an essential aspect of our village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4733  Respondent: 8887873 / S E Lea  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

1. Development Site referenced Policy A41

I object to the proposed development of land to the south of West Horsley in East lane (Referenced Policy A41) which has been added to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission since the public consultation on the Draft local Plan in 2014 with a proposal to build 90 new houses. Again this is good agricultural land, currently in use as pasture for grazing horses. East lane is a lane, precisely as the name suggests. It is narrow and poorly maintained, with little room for large vehicles to pass. For most of its length there is only one footpath which changes sides, thus causing pedestrians to have to cross the road. Recently a new pinch point was created outside Waterloo Farm Cottage, where a footpath has been installed, allowing only a single lane for traffic. As mentioned in Point 3 above, East lane is frequently flooded with surface water after only a moderate amount of rainfall. It certainly would not accommodate the large volume of increased traffic as a result of developments on this and the site referenced Policy A38).
In summary, I strongly object to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission particularly the removal of the village of West Horsley from the Metropolitan Green Belt and the inclusion of the proposed large development sites for West Horsley. There appears to be little or no plan to prioritise the use of brownfield sites and no allowance for 'windfall sites' (which were counted by Mole Valley Council in their local Plan).

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1514  Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

Again, traffic congestion and road safety are of major concern given that an additional 90 houses will produce somewhere in the region of 200+ cars. East Lane (where this site is situated) is a tight two-lane road that was built for the pony & trap / stage coach era but which already carried a significant volume of traffic with people turning off the Ockham Road and/or the Drift into East Lane to go to The Raleigh School and/or make their way towards Guildford and other environs. The fact that The Raleigh School is served by East Lane means that some young children make their way to school on bikes / scooters etc and any additional cars will only increase the risk of tragic accidents. The village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for expansion. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. For the above reasons, I OBJECT to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7459  Respondent: 8892353 / Elizabeth Russell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

Site A41: Adjoining East Lane, West Horsley: (90 houses)

Again, traffic congestion and road safety are of major concern given that an additional 90 houses will produce somewhere in the region of 200+ cars. East Lane (where this site is situated) is a tight two-lane road that was built for the pony & trap / stage coach era but which already carried a significant volume of traffic with people turning off the Ockham Road and/or the Drift into East Lane to go to The Raleigh School and/or make their way towards Guildford and other environs. The fact that The Raleigh School is served by East Lane means that some young children make their way to school on bikes / scooters etc and any additional cars will only increase the risk of tragic accidents. The village shops of East Horsley are in two separate ribbon-strips but both already have inadequate car parking facilities (as does the railway station) and there is no land available for expansion. Similarly, the very limited shops in West Horsley are served by nothing more than a small lay-by and again with absolutely no room for expansion. For the above reasons, I OBJECT to this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2973  Respondent: 8900865 / Robert E. and Clodagh D. Beale  Agent:
**Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41**

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

Please allow us to make some comments on the latest draft. First, thank you for removing Site A 41 from the list of development sites in the previous version; we note, however that this site is being retained for a possible rebuilding of a local school. In view of its proximity to our house, this would be unsatisfactory to us, and we would object to such a proposal.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7359  **Respondent:**  8915905 / Rhiannon Stroud  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I object to Policy A41 (Land to the South of East Lane)

I object to the development of this site for 90 houses as it is Green Belt land and it contributes to the openness and rural feel of West Horsley Village. I also object to the application to use this land to relocate The Raleigh Primary School as the need for this development hasn’t been proven. While the school is popular and has a long waiting list, including some children in Horsley, the school’s sibling policy has resulted in approximately one third of pupils coming from villages outside of East and West Horsley. Until this situation has been examined and it is established whether a change in this policy would lead to enough places for children for whom this is their local school, I cannot see any reason to increase the size of the school. If the reason for moving the school is other than the need to expand, then I am yet to be persuaded that the impact of additional housing on the school’s current site is worth the irreversible loss of Green Belt Land. Until the need and substance of this application has been fully considered and consulted on, I oppose the application.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/945  **Respondent:**  8917121 / Paul Douet  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

As residents of West Horsley for over 25 years, we are writing to you in SUPPORT of the specific proposed change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan relating to the deletion of the previously proposed Policy A41.

We are pleased to note that the site, previously indicated for housing under Policy A41, has now been removed from the housing sites allocation, remaining within the protection of the Green Belt designation.

We would like to thank you for your decision to remove the threat of a built development and maintain this important natural area of West Horsley under the protection of the Green Belt area.

It can now remain a vital contributor to the open character of the village, which we believe is essential.
We thought it was appropriate to express our support specifically for this particular change to the proposed Submission Local Plan (2017).

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4120</th>
<th>Respondent: 8930305 / Elaine Best</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am pleased to see the removal of site A41. However, this appears to be little more than lip-service to the very real concerns expressed by many people living in West Horsley who experience the significant constraints the existing infrastructure presents on a daily basis now.

The NPPF is clear that a Council’s need for additional housing does not constitute special / exceptional circumstances for building in the green belt. Reference to ‘affordable homes’ in this vicinity is, of itself, misleading as “affordable” in West Horsley at 80% of market value puts the price approaching £500k!

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7788</th>
<th>Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the allocation of land at East Lane, WH – allocation

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4323</th>
<th>Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A41 - Land to south of West Horsley

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.
There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7219  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify its removal.

I OBJECT to the change to the settlement boundary required to facilitate this development.

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

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4237  Respondent: 8948385 / Gillian Eve  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A41 - Land to south of West Horsley

I SUPPORT the removal of this site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1280  Respondent: 8958369 / B.P. Austin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object strongly to policy Site A41 ( East Lane). This encroachment into the Green Belt is a travesty of bending the rules to accommodate an opportunistic developer. There is at present a clear boundary along East Lane, there is no defensible boundary for the proposed site which the site map shows is an irregular chunk taken out of the Green Belt. It should be rejected.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7166</th>
<th>Respondent: 9052673 / Beverley Nash</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>: ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. However I am supportive of re-siting The Raleigh School to site 41 (East Lane) and in return building houses on the current site of The Raleigh School and on Weston Lea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/920</th>
<th>Respondent: 9102145 / Mary Watson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>: ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to object to the Local Plan proposals for West Horsley on the following grounds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A41</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan has included this new site with a proposal to build 90 homes on the open fields (green belt land) of West Horsley (Policy A41).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This new site will totally destroy the character of West Horsley. West Horsley is a rural village and one of its main features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road. These fields do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill at all. I cannot understand why this piece of land would have been picked for development at all as it does not satisfy any of the criteria for development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5280</th>
<th>Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong>: ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A41: Land to the South of East Lane, West Horsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT</strong> on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I STRONGLY OBJECT</strong> on the grounds that the boundary of this site totally fails to comply with the defensible boundary requirements set out in NPPF paragraph 85, and in the Green Belt and Countryside Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp172/4296</td>
<td>Respondent: 9335041 / David Reeve</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the removal of this Allocation from the draft Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2625</th>
<th>Respondent: 9412065 / Stephen Bray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A41 - Lollesworth Farm:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is now understood that The Raleigh School have elected to relocate onto this site, which will consequently be unable to accommodate the projected housing provision, but which may free up the existing Northcote Crescent site for some limited housing development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevertheless. it would now seem pressing that alternative housing site(s) be found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site benefits from close proximity to Lollesworth Lane on the north side of the railway line, a well-trodden pedestrian walkway with its bridge over the railway line, thence down to East Horsley and the railway station. It is, in my view, of critical strategic and infrastructural importance that as much of the northern side of the railway line passing through the village as is possible is utilised as a pedestrian/cycle route, with Lollesworth Lane (opposite the junction of East Lane and Long Reach) acting as a fulcrum point between the north and south parts of West Horsley.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1167</th>
<th>Respondent: 9577857 / Nick Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this development on the grounds of loss of green space, development on the Green Belt and increased urbanisation in a low population area, leading to increased traffic, demand for over-subscribed local services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2180</th>
<th>Respondent: 10805409 / David Walker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Policy A41

I specifically object to the Proposed Site - Policy A41

- The Local Plan has included a new site - Policy A41 with a proposal to build 90 homes
- This site is open fields green belt land and the land is one of the most important rural aspects of the village
- The Policy will irrevocably destroy the character of West Horsley village as one of its most important rural features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road
- The fields included in Policy A41 do not satisfy the criteria for development - they do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill
- Development on a current site of open fields in green belt land surrounded by undeveloped countryside is in breach of the government's guidelines on building in the green belt
- Residents on East Lane have previously had their planning applications refused on the basis that it interferes with the green belt contained in Policy A41 - why has this now changed?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1560  Respondent: 10843905 / G King  Agent:

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

Site Allocation A41 – Strongly object

Is on green belt and backs onto ancient woodland. This side of East Lane is not densely populated and retains a rural aspect and openness. I notice that in recent months the owners of the land have allowed the hedges to fall into neglect in an attempt to obscure the openness.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6861  Respondent: 10843905 / G King  Agent:

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

Site Allocation A41 – Strongly object

Is on green belt and backs onto ancient woodland. This side of East Lane is not densely populated and retains a rural aspect and openness. This was not identified as a site for development previously yet is added because the landowner has made it available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy A41. By permitting a development of this area a larger green area inside gets locked in by the development. There is no good reason given for this change of the settlement boundary. The existing adjacent houses have a rural character, which would be destroyed by a new development in this location.

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

I Object to Policy A41.
It could never satisfy Policy S1.

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

With regard to one of the sites the Council now proposes to delete Bewley Homes is supportive of this amendment for the reasons set out below:

Land to the South of West Horsley (Policy A41) – SUPPORT: Bewley Homes supports the proposed deletion of this draft allocation from the Plan by the Council. This site is in a location known for surface water flooding as identified by the Council. As such and in accordance with the sequential approach the Council should be looking at locations where surface water flood risk is not an issue such as Bewley Homes’ promotion site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/869  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I OBJECT TO site A41 land to south of West Horsley.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1480  Respondent: 15325569 / Oscar Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I object to Policy A41 the new draft local plan which contains a new proposal to build 90 homes on the open fields (green belt land) of West Horsley in addition to the already proposed 135 houses at Manor Farm (Policy A38), 120 houses at Waterloo Road (Policy A40) and 40 at Bell and Colvill (Policy A37).

I have lived in East Lane all my life and I think that this new site (A41) is one of the most distinguishing rural aspects of the village and if allowed to be developed will destroy the character of West Horsley. West Horsley is a rural village and one of its main features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road. These fields have no houses on any side and do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill at all. It doesn't appear to me to be suitable land for development without destroying the green belt and the current village.

There is also no infrastructure for all these new homes. There are only 2 shops in West Horsley, no post office, no medical centre and very little public transport. The roads are already very busy with traffic and the new houses will only add more.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3953  Respondent: 15466433 / Caspar Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

This new site will totally destroy the character of West Horsley. West Horsley is a rural village and one of its main features is that on the entry roads to the village (mainly Long Reach in this instance) there is a vista across fields as there is only development on one side of the road. These fields do not abut the currently defined village settlement on any side and so cannot be considered an extension of the settlement or infill at all. I cannot understand why this piece of land would have been picked for development at all as it does not satisfy any of the criteria for development.

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

Attached documents:
## Comment ID: PSLPS16/4502  Respondent: 15486113 / Ian and Margaret Walker  Agent:

### Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

### 2 - Objection to the number of houses being built in the four proposed sites - specifically policy A41:

A suggested 35 percent increase in housing in West Horsley is a monstrous figure for this community. Vast developments impinge on the rural nature of villages and destroy the very reason why people want to live there.

The purpose of the Green Belt is to provide 'lungs' for a Metropolitan Area and West Horsley village serves that purpose. This particular proposal to build 90 homes on the open fields will destroy that. For ever it's been possible to take quiet country walks starting at Lollesworth Lane across to the Sheepleas and beyond, appreciating the rural aspect from the start.

As a Nation we need to protect villages like West Horsley and concentrate on developing in areas where there IS sufficient infrastructure to support new homes. Guildford Borough Council need to consider this very carefully and ensure that the much needed new homes that are built are not going to impact on this valuable commodity which once lost can never be retrieved.

This is not a NIMBY objection but an appeal for common sense.

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

**Attached documents:**

## Comment ID: PSLPS16/7724  Respondent: 15501217 / Luke Sarti  Agent:

### Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41 relating to land south of East Lane. This is in contravention of para 85 NPPF which states that borders must clear and readily recognised. The natural border is the wood to its east. The inclusion of this site is not in keeping with the current settlement and character of the village; houses front East Lane up the woods to the east of this site which borders the road for approximately 400 yards. The land is green belt, no exceptional circumstances are made.

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

**Attached documents:**

## Comment ID: pslp172/2136  Respondent: 15590465 / Peter Edwards  Agent:

### Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41

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

Further to your letter, dated 7th June 2017, inviting me to take part in the targeted consultation on Guildford Borough Council’s Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites (2017), I am writing to you as I fully support the proposed change to the Proposed Submission Local Plan relating to the deletion of the previously proposed **Policy A41**.
It is pleasing to see that the site which had been previously indicated for housing under policy A41 has now been removed from the allocation sites for housing and now remains within the protection of the Green Belt designation. It is a greatly appreciated decision that means that this natural and beautiful area of West Horsley has been returned to the protection of the Green Belt area and will remain as such to the enhancement of the ruralness and open spaces which make Horsley the beautiful place that it is.

Thank you for this proposed change and I personally give you my full support re your decision.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6808  Respondent: 15604833 / Susan Vaughan Jones  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

1. At no stage during the previous draft local Plan process and subsequent consultation was this site proposed for consideration; now suddenly it has been included in the present draft Local Plan increasing the development burden within West Horsley
2. The site to the south of East Lane adjoining Lollesworth Lane is an important green space to be viewed and enjoyed when traversing East Lane in either direction

1. This site is unsustainable and unsuitable for the proposed density of development due in part to its green belt status; in part to infrastructure fragility and incapacity (drainage and road surfaces - both already failing due to lack of ongoing expenditure to improve capacity)

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7151  Respondent: 15629377 / The Woodland Trust (Jack Taylor)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>Land to the south of West Horsley</td>
<td>West Horsley</td>
<td>C3 90 homes</td>
<td>Adjacent</td>
<td>Lollesworth Wood ASNW, TQ085541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
 Whilst I am not opposed to new housing in West Horsley per se; the scale of this proposed development in West Horsley is excessive and as set out above not reflecting need in any way. In particular I am most strongly opposed to site A41. This site is critical to West Horsley’s semi-rural identity and character and it is vitally important that this open green aspect is maintained through what is, in so many ways, the centre of the village. Adoption of A41 would enable this open space to become the only development of any significant depth along the whole of the southern side of the East lane / The Street corridor and would severely compromise this ‘green gap’ between the northern and southern parts of West Horsley.

This is contrary to at least two of the five essential purposes of Green Belt as defined at NPPF paragraph 80 (namely to check unrestricted sprawl and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment – functions which this part of the Green Belt, including this site, is recognised as performing at paragraph 8.2 of the Guildford Green Belt and Countryside Study).

This site had not previously been include as a potential development site within previous draft versions of the emerging Local Plan and assessment of this site, in background studies forming the evidence base for this Site Allocation, is based on incorrect information.

Two key incorrect bases are:

1. In the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) 2016 – Page 388 in respect of site reference 2063 (‘the site of East Lane’) it states under ‘summary of land designations’ – “Green Belt adjoining settlement boundary”. This is incorrect. Unlike any of the other three sites proposed in West Horsley, this site currently has no boundary that adjoins the village Settlement boundary as defined in the GBC Local Plan 2003.

1. Also, The Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study produced by Pegasus Planning Group, Volume III – Appendix VI – Sustainability Walking Distance Plans for Land Surrounding the Villages refers to the above site, plus the field beyond that the Council now propose removing from the Green Belt (together with a section of Lollesworth Wood) as site D. All assumed walking paths to (i) Nearest Local Centre, (ii) Healthcare Facility and (iii) Railway Station are presuming that access could have been gained to Lollesworth Lane via the undesignated (save that it has been proposed to be removed from the Green Belt) field to the south and fronting Lollesworth Lane. This field is currently used for grazing sheep and is owned by Mr & Mrs. Richard Wills of Lollesworth Farm and they have advised me and others that they would not permit such access route across their field, therefore the assumption used by Pegasus Planning Group is incorrect and may well have a material effect on their conclusions.

Furthermore, any development on A41 would not be consistent with the distinctive settlement pattern of the village and the important relationship between the built environment and the surrounding landscape (i.e. development on one side of the route only). In my opinion, it will harm important views of the village from surrounding landscape (from Lollesworth Lane) and from within the village of local landmarks (of Lollesworth Wood), contrary to Policy D4 of the Proposed Local Plan.

Allocation of the site will not “promote sustainable patterns of development” and the wildlife / environmental amenity loss of this site is likely to result in a significant detriment to the village’s character. Furthermore it will cause harm to the biodiversity and natural environment of the adjoining Lollesworth Wood SNCL. Indeed, this is contrary to Sustainability
Objective 1 of the Sustainability Appraisal framework set out at Table 4.1 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal.

Policy I4: Green and blue infrastructure; states that “Permission will not be granted for proposals that are likely to materially harm the nature conservation interests of local sites unless clear justification is provided that the need for development clearly outweighs the impact on biodiversity.” Local Sites are earlier defined in the policy as including Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).

Furthermore, there is no reason at all for the amendment to the Greenbelt behind the field beyond site A41 other than to prepare for a potential second phase development in the next Local Plan and surely it cannot be considered to be justified by “exceptional circumstances” when no alternative use is currently proposed and its current and historic use is as pasture?

I strongly object to the alteration of the Greenbelt around A41 and the field beyond and to the inclusion of A41 in the Local Plan.

Across any of the adopted sites in West Horsley, careful consideration must be given to the proposed density of any future developments. The current proposed density is not appropriate for such rural and semi-rural village location and are out of character for the village as it currently largely comprises low density housing, with a considerable mix of ages and housing styles.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7466  Respondent: 15649345 / Matthew Sarti  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41 relating to land south of East Lane. This is in contravention of para 85 NPPF which states that borders must clear and readily recognised. The natural border is the wood to its east. The inclusion of this site is out of kilter with the current settlement and character of the village; houses front East Lane up the woods to the east of this site which borders the road for approximately 400 yards. The land is green belt, no exceptional circumstances are made.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8138  Respondent: 15671297 / JB Planning Associates (Sue Foster)  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )

Our representations with respect to Policy A41 are set out in Section 4 of our submission.

**Representation on Policy A41: Land to the South of West Horsley**
Introduction

1. This representation is submitted on behalf of Countryside Properties in response to the Council’s decision to allocate Land to the South of West Horsley as a Strategic Site Allocation (Policy A41) in the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Local Plan.

1. This pastoral farmland, of approximately 8 ha, has been identified in the Submission Local Plan as a housing allocation for approximately 90 homes (C3). The site comprises of 2 fields currently used as pasture and paddocks.

1. Below we briefly set out why we consider the proposed allocation is less sustainable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road,

1. With regard to the landscape and visual impact of the proposed allocation and Green Belt considerations, we refer below to the key findings of the ‘Site Comparison Study’ prepared on behalf of our Client by Barton The full findings of the Study are set out in Appendix 4.3.

1. In terms of sustainability we draw upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, which we have, where necessary, amended to address inaccuracies that we have noted with respect to our Client’s These results are set out in a table (see Appendix 4.4).

Landscape and Visual Impact

1. Barton Willmore has produced a Site Comparison Study, which provides a comparative assessment of our Client’s site against 4 other sites that have been identified as housing allocations within the Proposed Submission Local These were selected on the basis that they are also located outside of the settlement boundaries, within the Green Belt and are non-strategic. The sites are:
   - Policy A38: Land to the West of West Horsley
   - Policy A41: Land to the South of West Horsley
   - Policy A44: Land to the West of Winds Ridge and Send Hill, Send
   - Policy A47: Land to the East of The Paddocks, Flexford

2. Below we identify some of its key findings with respect to the impact of the development of Site A41 on landscape character:
   - Potential for substantial loss of vegetation along East Lane to accommodate the frontages of new development and new access routes which would comprise hedgerows and mature trees, particularly along its boundaries;
   - Further urbanisation and also the perception of encroachment of the settlement pattern in a southerly direction; and
   - Visual effects to views from the adjoining properties, and PRoW

3. With respect to the contribution that Site A41 makes to the function of the Green Belt, Barton Willmore identified that:
   - Development would result in the erosion of the semi-rural lane character of East Lane which would become wholly suburban in character in this location, with residential development on both sides and therefore would result in substantial encroachment.
   - Development in a southerly direction from East Lane would result in an alteration to the settlement pattern. Furthermore, there is no robust defensible boundary to the southern part of the site, so the local landscape to the south would therefore be subject to further development pressure.

4. Barton Willmore’s study concludes that our Client’s site is comparative with the other sites in relation to landscape and visual considerations, in that it does not score significantly differently from the others to warrant its exclusion from the Proposed Submission Local Plan. In fact, our Client’s site scores considerably better in some respects to the other sites with regard to landscape and visual considerations, for example, our Client’s site is of lesser tranquillity due to the fact that it is adjoined by New Pond Road, and does not contain any footpaths, listed buildings or notable landscape features within the site.

Sustainability
5. JBPA has produced a Site Comparison Table (Appendix4) which looks at the same 4 sites identified in the Barton Willmore Assessment in terms of their overall sustainability as proposed housing allocations. It also compares these sites with our Client’s land at New Pond Road, Farncombe, and with land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford (Site A46) which has been brought forward as a new proposed housing allocation at the Proposed Submission Draft stage of the Local Plan. A separate representation on Site A46 is included with our submission in section 5.

6. When considering sustainability, we have drawn initially upon the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local We have, however, where necessary amended the scorings to address inaccuracies that we have noted in the SA with respect to our Client’s site. This includes correcting the distance to the nearest Primary School as the SA suggests this is less than 2km, when in fact it is less than 1km. We have also identified from available MAFF records that our Client’s land contains Grade 3 agricultural land, as opposed to Grade 1 land which is identified in the SA.

7. Below we set out our key conclusions when comparing Site A41 with our Client’s site:
   ◦ Site A41 scored poorly (red) in relation to 8 sustainability criteria, whereas our Client’s site only scored poorly in 3 criteria.
   ◦ Site A41 is further from a key employment site, healthcare facilities, recreation facilities, a secondary school and a railway station than our Client’s site.
   ◦ Site A41 is closer to a European Site (SPA and SAC) and a Designation of Local Importance than our Client’s site.
   ◦ Our Client’s site scored worse than A41 with respect to flood risk, and its location within the AONB, however we have demonstrated in our site specific representation in relation to our Client’s site (Section 3) that it makes limited to no contribution to the special qualities and features of the Surrey Hills AONB, and that the area of the site within a flood zone has been agreed with the Environment Agency and will be left.

Conclusion

8. Informed by the findings of Barton Willmore’s “Site Comparison Study” and the Sustainability Appraisal of the Guildford Proposed Submission Local Plan, this representation sets out why we consider the proposed allocation at land to the South of West Horsley (Site A41) is less sustainable and suitable than our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, Farncombe.

9. Barton Willmore’s study identifies that the site makes a substantial contribution to two Green Belt purposes and its development has the potential to have substantial visual effects, including the loss of vegetation along East Lane to accommodate the frontages of new development; adverse visual effects to views from the adjoining properties, and PRoW 98; and the perception of encroachment of the settlement pattern.

10. With respect to Sustainability we have determined that the site scored poorly (red) over significantly more sustainability criteria than our Client’s Thus, our Client’s site represents a more sustainable location than a comparable site identified in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Tests of Soundness

11. We consider that there is a risk of the Local Plan being found unsound with the proposed allocation of Site A41, instead of our Client’s site on land to the south of New Pond Road, because it will not be ‘justified’, as it does not represent the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Proposed Modifications

12. In view of the above considerations, we believe that Land to the South of West Horsley (Site A41) should be removed from the Local Plan prior to submission for Examination.

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

Attached documents:  Policy A41.pdf (443 KB)
Please see our representations with respect to specific sections of the plan on the Question 6 Comments Form.

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

Attached documents: [Policy A41.pdf](Policy A41.pdf) (443 KB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7797  **Respondent:** 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I object to the allocation of land at East Lane, WH

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7826  **Respondent:** 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.

There are limited surface water sewers in the area so would need to understand the drainage strategy for this proposal.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8125  **Respondent:** 15706689 / Hope Sarti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A41

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

I OBJECT to the inclusion of Policy A41 relating to land south of East Lane. This is in contravention of para 85 NPPF which states that borders must clear and readily recognised. The natural border is the wood to its east. The inclusion of this site is not in keeping with the current settlement and character of the village; houses front East Lane up
the woods to the east of this site which borders the road for approximately 400 yards. The land is green belt, no exceptional circumstances are made.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3120</th>
<th>Respondent: 17536481 / Mr Stephen Isaac and the Raleigh School</th>
<th>Agent: Mr Philip Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A41</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction
1. These representations are submitted on behalf of Mr Stephen Isaac (who owns the greater part of site A41) and the Raleigh School. They are to address proposed changes in the amended draft local plan.

2. The south-west part of A41 (extending to some 1.05 ha and identified as parcel 7 on the conceptual plan) is owned by Mr Duncan Roe but who is not a party to these representations. It is relevant to note that Mr Stephen Isaac has a binding covenant over "parcel 7" prohibiting the erection of any buildings without his consent: accordingly he is able to control any development over that part of A41.

Previous Submissions
3. On 15 July 2016 submissions were made to, primarily, relocate the Raleigh School from its present 2 sites onto A41 and to increase it from a 2FE to a 3FE primary school: this partly to take up the existing waiting list but also having regard to the inevitable additional need arising from the new housing proposed in the locality. The cost being funded through the redevelopment of the school's existing sites.

4. It is not intended to repeat the points made in the previous submissions but, instead, to append them to these further (current) submissions.

Current Submissions
5. From the response to our July 2016 submissions it would appear that the principle reason for not accepting the relocation of the Raleigh School onto A41 was the uncertainty as to the viability and, therefore, deliverability of the site for that purpose. These submissions, therefore, address the viability (and hence deliverability) of the site.

Enclosures
i. Location Plan to identify the Raleigh School and A41 in the context
ii. Site A-11: Conceptual Master Plan (July 2017)
iii. indicative housing site layout for the Raleigh School campus site
iv. A copy of the July 2016 Submissions

6. Before dealing with the viability aspects we would point out that, having considered public views, the conceptual plan has been amended to substantially reduce the extent of housing from 1.45 ha down to some 0.50 ha. Thus, rather than 20 very low density dwellings, it is now proposed to have 10 smaller low/medium density dwellings. The effect of this is to increase very significantly the amount of open green space. It will be noted that the area now proposed to be utilised either as open playing fields or as paddocks is increased by over 50% from the July 2016 proposal to some 3.3 ha: now virtually 70% of the site.

7. The location of the new school and its associated car park has also been moved closer to East Lane which we believe is a more realistic site for the built part of the new school. In addition a drop-off/pick-up parking area is shown intended to be formed by a green "Grasscrete" type construction.
8. In order to assess the viability it is necessary to have a realistic assessment of the number of dwellings that the school's existing two sites might accommodate. For this purpose an indicative, policy compliant, layout plan has been produced for the main campus site (that extends to some 1.09 ha) which, being a slightly awkward shape and surrounded by housing, has to have proper respect to adjoining properties.

9. The indicative layout plan shows 17 x 3 and 4-bedroom open market dwellings and 11 (39.3%) x 2 and 3-bedroom affordable dwellings. In addition 0.13 ha of public open space is indicated. This gives a density of some 25.7 dph on the gross area or 29.2 dph on the net area. Thus the density is relatively low and I have no doubt could be increased but, for the purpose of assessing the viability it is appropriate to work on a conservative, rather than optimistic density. However the reality is that the site can readily accommodate at least 30 dwellings.

10. The playing field site extends to some 1.34 ha and has the benefit of full vehicular and pedestrian access over Weston Lea with such right of way having been reserved when the Weston Lea site was sold by Surrey County Council to New Ideal Homes in 1984 and where specific reference in the reservation was made in the possible residential development of the playing field site.

11. We are aware that, at present, the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning indicates the east half of the playing field as being within Flood Zone 3. We have had informal discussions with the promoters of site A39 who have advised that the EA has accepted that their Flood Map is incorrect and are in the process of redrawing it. The effect will be that, probably, no more than 0.25 ha will be within Flood Zones 2 or 3. With local evidence indicating that the playing field has not suffered from flooding in living memory it would be appropriate to utilise part of that 0.25 ha as public open space. Thus a realistic assessment for the playing field is some 35 dwellings.

12. The school has taken formal advice of Knight Frank which suggests that (based upon planning permission being granted for the redevelopment as outlined) the two sites should yield a land value of some £13.0 million allowing for a 40% affordable housing provision. It is relevant to note that GBC has the ability to reduce the affordable housing provision where viability may be an issue. Thus the affordable housing provision was reduced to 20% this would add some £2.0 million to the land value.

13. The 10 houses proposed for A41 should realise a land value of £2.5 million. A further factor is that there will be significant Infrastructure Contributions from the new housing proposed under the new local plan within the school's catchment area. This should generate a further, approximate, £1.5 million available for primary education provision that should be made available specifically for the benefit of the third form entry element of the new Raleigh School: such being largely required to service those new dwellings.

14. Thus the redevelopment of the Raleigh's existing 2 sites, the 10 dwellings proposed on A41 and the infrastructure contributions should yield an aggregate of some £17 million (or £19 million if the affordable housing is reduced to 20%) for the new 3FE primary school and sports hall on A41.

15. It is further relevant to note that this does not factor in any financial contribution from Surrey County Council, as the statutory education provider, for the third form element of the 3FE primary school.

16. Based upon information provided to us by Surrey County Council an "all in" cost for the new 3FE primary school (as indicated on the conceptual plan) is likely to be some £13.0 million. The sports hall will add a further £2.5 million giving an aggregate of some £15.5 million. Thus there is an approximate £1.5 million (or £3.5 with a 20% affordable provision) cushion between the anticipated development costs and the land value (including infrastructure contribution) proceeds.

17. The Raleigh School would not embark on this project unless they were confident that it was a financially viable proposition. We trust that this further information will demonstrate that viability (and hence deliverability) is not an issue. Accordingly the amended draft local plan can be further amended to reflect the redevelopment of the Raleigh School's existing sites and its relocation onto A41 as proposed.

Proposed designation of Playing Field
18. We were concerned to see the proposal to designate the West Lea playing field as Open Space. Entirely without prejudice to the submissions detailed above, if you are still minded not to accept the relocation of the Raleigh School onto A41 then we consider the designation of the playing field as Open Space would be wholly inappropriate for a piece of land that would then, by necessity, remain a private playing field for a primary school. Thus, under those circumstances, the designation of that land should remain purely for what it is (and therefore would continue to be): Playing Fields.

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

Attached documents: LP2017 - Scanned - Philip J.C. Stone.pdf (1.8 MB)
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/540</th>
<th>Respondent: 8553761 / A Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more. Where is your transport provision study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1073</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having already objected to the 2016 plan Im staggered to see that the latest draft has completely ignored the tens of thousands of objections submitted and has now come up with another draft that is even far worse for the village of Send than previous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would seem that the GBC has a predetermined agenda to build on the green belt regardless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would therefore like to raise the following objections to the latest changes to the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because an increase to 60 homes is just too big for this area it will make surface water flooding which is already bad in this area even worse and will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1075</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because an increase to 60 homes is just too big for this area it will make surface water flooding which is already bad in this area even worse and will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to this development because the additional traffic from that development coupled with the traffic from the new marina with 80 berths which you have agreed further down Tannery Lane which is mainly a single lane with passing places.

The Marina was identified as a high priority requirement and something the village apparently ‘had to have’. Having spoken to many locals, it would appear that this would have been so far down their list of requirements to actually not be on the list at all! It was a travesty the development was voted through by GBC when clearly there were valid objections.

These same objections remain and will be compounded by the inclusion of the Clockbarn nursery site. This additional traffic will be unable safely to join the much overused main road through Send. This road is the main through road from Woking to the A3 and M25 which is already used to capacity especially by articulated trucks and heavy vehicles for which the road was never designed. Additional traffic joining from Tannery Lane would have great difficulty and any attempt to ease the problem with a roundabout or traffic lights would simply exacerbate the situation.

The access point is so narrow it would clearly be a safety hazard and a potential accident black spot. Vehicles would not be able to join the main road and so would back up along Tannery Lane at peak times. This would be really dangerous and if there was an emergency then the necessary services would be unable to gain access to the site and attend the incident and this could have serious consequences.

GBC has a responsibility to its residents to ensure proposed developments meet highways safety standards and I fail to see how an access point at a narrow junction of Send Road and Tannery Lane will meet this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4278</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane**

As stated many times previously, this narrow lane does not lend itself to accommodating more traffic. It should also be noted that planning permission for 63 apartments is already granted at the Tannery under reference 14/P/00575 and 00576 as amended. An additional 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery would increase the number of dwellings in Tannery Lane by nearly 400%.

The junction with Send Road (A247) is busy and has poor sight lines. In the other direction it enters Papercourt Lane which is even narrower. The land currently floods, despite the recent improvements to the road drainage from digging out ditches. A planning application for a large Marina in the same lane was recently granted and the spoil from this development was to be placed on this land. These actions will only exacerbate this flooding problem for everyone in the lane, and for properties in Send Road and Wharf Lane.

Clockbarn Nursery is designated as agricultural land within the Green Belt. The fact that it has been allowed to deteriorate should not be a passport to changing its status. It is a nesting habitat for bats which are a protected species.

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

**Attached documents:** [3.JPG (31 KB)]

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7690</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane**

As stated many times previously, this narrow lane does not lend itself to accommodating more traffic. It should also be noted that planning permission for 63 apartments is already granted at the Tannery under reference 14/P/00575 and 00576 as amended. An additional 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery would increase the number of dwellings in Tannery Lane by nearly 400%.

The junction with Send Road (A247) is busy and has poor sight lines. In the other direction it enters Papercourt Lane which is even narrower. The land currently floods, despite the recent improvements to the road drainage from digging out ditches. A planning application for a large Marina in the same lane was recently granted and the spoil from this development was to be placed on this land. These actions will only exacerbate this flooding problem for everyone in the lane, and for properties in Send Road and Wharf Lane.

Clockbarn Nursery is designated as agricultural land within the Green Belt. The fact that it has been allowed to deteriorate should not be a passport to changing its status. It is a nesting habitat for bats which are a protected species.

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

**Attached documents:** [a44.png (120 KB)]
Residential Land Allocations in Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common

6.01 Send Parish Council object to the following proposals related to residential land allocations included within the 2017 draft Guildford Local Plan:

- Site A42 – Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send – 60 homes.

The reasons for objection are detailed below.

6.02 The 2016 draft Local Plan included Clockbarn Nurseries on Tannery Lane as a residential site allocation for 45 homes. As part of the consultation process, Send Parish Council made representations to Guildford Borough Council regarding this allocation. These representations stated Send Parish Council’s concerns regarding the undue stress that the development would exert on the village’s infrastructure and the flooding concerns of the site. Other information, such as with the marina application, emphasised other aspects, such as the importance of the area to flora and fauna, such as bats. Further information on these concerns can be seen in greater detail in Send Parish Council’s representations made in July 2016.

6.03 The 2017 draft Local Plan once again includes a residential allocation on the site of Clockbarn Nurseries. However, despite the site not changing in size, this allocation has been altered to increase the allocation from 45 new homes to 60 new homes. It is not clear on what basis the plan has deemed an increase to be acceptable.

6.04 Send Parish Council view this increase in the proposed number of homes on the Clockbarn site to be unacceptable. The stretch of Tannery Lane that connects the site to the Send village is narrow and it is difficult for vehicles to pass, especially large commercial vehicles that would be involved in the construction process. Short term parking along this stretch further limits accessibility to this site. Pedestrian infrastructure would be required in order to create a safe environment that pedestrians can use. Furthermore, the consented Marina scheme on the adjacent land and any proposed intensification of Send Business Centre (see also 5.07 – 5.13 above) would significantly increase vehicular flow along Tannery Lane, past the Clockbarn Nursery site. The increase in the number of proposed homes from 45 to 60 would simply exacerbate this problem, making the issues of accessibility and pedestrian safety even more acute.

6.05 The parish council are also concerned that the cumulative, strategic picture regarding transport and the impact on Send Road is not clear enough in the current plan.

6.06 Changes sought to make the Local Plan sound:

- Remove Allocation A42.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This would be additional to housing development at the Tannery, and the major scheme for further marina space in the area. The local roads are wholly inadequate for the totality of all this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3590  Respondent: 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A 42, for an Increase in number of houses in Tannery Lane. No proper reasons are offered for this large increase which would aggravate the road traffic congestion, and overload local services.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3187  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to POLICY A42, CLOCKBARN TANNERY LANE: because it will illegally erode the Green Belt in Send Village, cause more flooding due to the greater number of houses proposed and worsen traffic problems and pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3723  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on the Clockbarn site in Send (ref A42) which is designated as agricultural land within the Green Belt. The fact that it has been allowed to deteriorate should not be a passport to changing its status. It is not suitable because it has poor access and the road cannot take the additional vehicular traffic which 45 houses would generate.

I OBJECT to the Building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because the road already suffers from serious overload, as previously accepted by Surrey County Council. An additional 45 houses would increase the number of dwellings in Tannery Lane by nearly 400% because planning permission already exists for 63 apartments at the Tannery business centre site under reference 14/P/00575 and 00576 as amended. It is disingenuous for GBC to express the belief that these may not be built. GBC gave permission and the owner has the right and locally it is understood the intention of building
them. Indeed work has commenced. Added to this would be the traffic generated by building and servicing the new narrow boat basin or “marina” under reference 14/P/00289. The road cannot cope with the traffic volume it currently has and could not possibly accommodate the massive increase in vehicular traffic consequent on these three developments. In simple terms if the number of dwellings increased by 400% so would the volume of domestic traffic in addition to an increase in commercial traffic. This does not bear thinking about.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because this massive increase in traffic would severely impact the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road where there is a problem every day because of poor visibility for traffic emerging from the side road causing danger and congestion to traffic on the main road. The suggestion that this would be alleviated by traffic lights is completely wrong as the installation of temporary traffic lights in Send Road earlier this month demonstrated. When traffic has to stop in either direction, as it does for traffic lights, Send Road quickly gets gridlocked.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because it fails to take into account the cumulative impact on traffic volumes in the rest of Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is very narrow, twisty and dangerous for its entire length. Much of it is single track with passing places and blind spots. There is a problem all the way down with vehicles trying to pass each other. When they meet they very often have to reverse in order to find a passing place. The problem is exacerbated by the high proportion of HGVs and large commercial vehicles currently going to the business centre, and destined to increase when the narrow boat basin is built. Tannery Lane is also very long. The biggest problem, which is often overlooked because planners fail to go there, is the stretch beyond the business centre going north. The final stretch of Tannery Lane before it joins Polesden Lane is only 9 feet wide for a distance of nearly 400 metres and cannot be made wider because of the nature reserve. A significant proportion of the traffic, estimated at about one third, enters Tannery Lane via Polesden Lane or Papercourt Lane which are themselves extremely narrow, especially Papercourt where some of the front garden boundaries on either side of the road are within little more than three metres of each other. There is also the extremely dangerous blind bend to the right when joining Newark Lane. These lanes were not meant for the high number of cars, vans and lorries which currently use them and could not possibly cope with an increase of the amount which would follow from this development, on top of the others.

The suggestion sometimes made that Tannery Lane could be widened totally fails to appreciate the constraints which exist. Any attempt to widen it would be defeated by the fact that the entrance from Send Road does not provide space for any significant widening; the Papercourt Lane exit is so narrow that front gardens on both sides of the lane would have to be compulsorily purchased; the stretch from Prews Farm Cottages to Papercourt Farm runs immediately alongside Papercourt Marshes so there is no scope for widening and in any event further traffic would damage Papercourt Marshes; the stretch from Papercourt Farm to the junction with Polesden Lane is single track nine feet wide which also runs alongside Papercourt Marshes. In any event a widening of Tannery and Papercourt by itself would be insufficient - because of the bends it would need to be straightened as well, a hugely expensive and well-nigh impossible task. In the whole of the Borough of Guildford, if one set out to find somewhere to build houses, Tannery Lane would be close to the bottom of the list of potential sites from the point of view of road access.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because there are virtually no pavements. The increase in traffic would therefore mean that pedestrians would face much greater risk. The only surfaced pavement in Tannery Lane is the first short section from Send Road confined to the north side. The other side is unsurfaced. After Peasblossom Cottage (about 80 metres from the junction with Send Road) there are no further pavements on either side for its entirety. Pedestrians walk in the road and have to dodge the traffic as best they can.

In addition to vehicular traffic it is used by residents and their visitors on foot: residents from Send Road and adjacent roads walking their dogs; walking groups and ramblers (on their way to Newark Priory, Ockham Mill and the Pyrford Water Meadows); equestrians; sports and recreational cyclists (because it is in the guide books as part of the cycling network based on Ripley); and anglers who fish in the Wey Navigation. It is therefore enjoyed by a lot of people whose safety should not be further jeopardised, and for whom a village amenity should not be ruined completely, by increasing any more the excessive number of vehicles the road already has to cope with.

Tannery Lane is an ancient rural road which is rich in wildlife which should not be damaged by pollution caused by increased traffic volumes. Clockbarn itself is a nesting habitat for bats which are a protected species, making it not only unsuitable to build there but a criminal offence to do so. Additional traffic pollution and noise alongside Papercourt Marshes will be detrimental to wildlife there too.
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because all the land in that area is prone to flooding. Although the Environment Agency maps include the area in flood zone 1 the reality is different, as a great deal of photographic evidence and local testimony can show.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1571  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes will overcrowd the site and result in even more traffic on Tannery Lane, which is a long, narrow and twisting lane with few passing places and many blind corners. I do not understand why Guildford Councillors cannot see the dangers that this poses to drivers, cyclists and pedestrians alike. The A247 junction with Tannery Lane is already a dangerous crossroads with poor lines of sight which will become even busier.

Surface water flooding in the area is already bad, will be worsened by the concreting over of this land.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3769  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

3.1 I object to the Policy 42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane. It is regrettable that notwithstanding the hundreds of representations explaining to GBC why this site was unsuitable for 45 houses, they have chosen to increase the number by one third to 60 houses. All the reasons previously advanced against 45 are still relevant only more so. Building 60 houses would exacerbate even more than 45 the extremely dangerous road junction where Tannery Lane joins the A247 Send Road. The road is narrow, there are no pavements beyond the first 100 or so metres and pedestrians, cyclists and country ramblers are currently at considerable risk. Increasing the concentration of houses and therefore of cars would be contrary to common sense.

3.2 I object to 60 houses because it would erode the Green Belt in Send village even more than 45. Clockbarn is within sight of the conservation area of the Wey Navigation and no exceptional circumstances have been shown. Before Green Belt land is used for housing it is necessary to show that exceptional circumstances exist. As a series of Court of Appeal cases have shown it has to be demonstrated that the harm to the community at large by taking Green Belt for housing would be less than if it were not taken. The crucial words, which the last version of the local plan ignored and this one continues to ignore, are “to the community at large”. As the Court of Appeal has pointed out one cannot rely on objectively assessed needs for housing without at the same time having regard to the policy restraints. Exceptional circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt has been shown to be outweighed by other considerations. Harm to the Green Belt is one of the factors which the NPPF requires to be taken into account.
3.3 I object to the building of 60 houses on this site because of the presence of common and soprano pipistrelle bats all over the site and their roosts on the adjacent plot. This would be in danger of breaching the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (Section 5), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (Schedule 2).

3.4 The site is full of other wild life too including some rare birds. Since it is within 5 km of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area development on this site could be contrary to Guildford Council’s own SPA Avoidance Strategy. As such it should not be included in the local plan.

3.5 The NPPF makes it clear that “the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by… minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible” (Para 109).

Since this objective will be virtually impossible to realise on this site it should not be included in the local plan.

3.6 GBC must be aware that the recent Surrey Wildlife Survey of flora and fauna showed that Surrey has suffered a very much higher rate of loss in species than the UK as a whole – 12% as compared to a national loss of 2%. Of a total of 404 priority species almost 31% are already locally extinct in Surrey while 37% are threatened or in worrying decline. When considering developments GBC should have regard to their obligations in this direction. If they are prepared to ignore them they should be asking themselves whether they are acting responsibly.

3.7 We are asked under Regulation 19 to restrict our comments to changes in the local plan. My objection to 60 houses should not be interpreted as an acceptance of 45. As made clear in 2016 my objection is to any houses at all on what I consider to be an unsuitable site. So my comments this time should be read in conjunction with what I said in 2016 and 2014.

Objections relating to both Send Business Park, Green Belt Policy 2 at paragraph 4.3.15 and Clockbarn Nursery, Policy A42.

4.1 I object to both developments on the grounds of susceptibility to surface flooding. There is considerable surface water flooding risk in Tannery Lane, as residents know only too well from their experience almost every year. It does not appear from their evidence base that GBC has explored this adequately in the same way as they did not do so in respect of last year’s narrowboat basin application to which they could usefully refer. GBC’s level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2016 makes no reference to Tannery Lane at all. It may be that they are relying on wet spots data from Surrey County Council but this is known to be inadequate. Primary sources, such as Envirocheck, whose work is based on the British Geographical Survey Flood Data, show ground water at 0.4 metres below ground level on the bend in the road near Maybankes. This is at the eastern corner of the Clockbarn site.

4.2 Local testimony asserts that some of the buildings at Send Business Park suffer from ground water flooding affecting their foundations which appears to be exacerbated by proximity to the Wey Navigation. This makes the site unstable and unsuitable for further development.

4.3 GBC’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment needs updating. The aggregate effect on flood risk of the Narrowboat Basin, plus Clockbarn plus Send Business Park would contravene paragraph 100 of the NPPF, that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk. At the very least all sources of flooding need to be correctly assessed which GBC has not done.

4.4 There is no recognition of the impact of these developments on sewage facilities which are already at full capacity.

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

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

Land at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

Objection

Send’s contribution has been increased at this site with no justification despite a reduction in overall housing numbers in the borough and the large number of previous objections.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3188  Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to this development because of the additional traffic from that development coupled with the traffic from the new marina with 80 berths which you have agreed further down Tannery Lane which is mainly a single lane with passing places. This additional traffic will be unable safely to join the much overused main road through Send. This road is the main through road from Woking to the A3 and M2S which is already used to capacity by general traffic including articulated trucks both local and European plus all manner of other heavy vehicles for which the road was never designed. There is also an increasing number of cyclists who are more at risk without a cycle lane for which there is no room and who slow the traffic down because they are difficult to pass. Additional traffic joining from Tannery Lane would have great difficulty and any attempt to ease the problem with a roundabout or traffic lights would simply exacerbate the situation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2896  Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

POLICY A42 Pages 241-2

I object to the proposed increase of a further 16 houses on the Clockbarn Nursery site. Traffic movements from that site coupled with traffic accessing the Marina development and then trying to join Send Road would cause considerable problems for residents and through traffic alike. Send Road is already used to capacity by traffic heading to and from Junction 10 on the M25 and was never intended to be used by today's very large articulated trucks. The essential traffic islands to enable pedestrians to cross represent an additional hazard plus the increasing number of cyclists exposed to rising levels of exhaust pollution.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2375  Respondent: 8586817 / Mr J Lawes  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42  

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

I OBJECT  

To the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery this is over development of an area with poor access.  

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4128  Respondent: 8587105 / Linda Parker-Picken  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  

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

I particularly object to the increase in proposed additional houses in Tannery Lane (Policy A42) from 45 to 60. The arguments against development in this narrow lane were clearly covered in the 2016 objections; yet this number has been increased rather than reduced or removed.  

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8222  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42  

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

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.  

There is inadequate access and high local traffic volume.  

Planning permission has been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina. This will generate additional heavy traffic. By adding another 45 houses this will greatly add to the traffic already there it will be even more chaotic. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous for vehicles joining the Main Road, this proposal will make it even worse.  

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3699  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:  

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to CLOCKBARN NURSERY TANNERY LANE POLICY A42 because:

Increasing the homes from 60 instead of 45 is an increase of 33% is far too many.

Why have all the previous objections been ignored and then you have added to the number of houses?

The Junction of Tannery Lane and the A247 are at gridlock, lots of times each day at present, and coming out from this junction is VERY DANGEROUS.

Adding any houses to Tannery Lane would add to the danger but 60 houses with say another 120 vehicles as well as delivery vans will give constant gridlock, and accidents.

It will add to the existing surface water flooding.

As a boat user on the River Wey Navigation it will detract from the lovely views from this Canal.

It will further erode our precious Green Belt, which the Government is Committed to keep.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6580  Respondent: 8591169 / Michael Bruton  Agent:

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

POLICY A42

1. I object to the development of Clockbarn Nursery (A42). The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is narrow and is already overused as a route to the local Business Park.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7198  Respondent: 8591521 / Mark Daniell  Agent:

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

I object to A42. Tannery Lane has already been designated for the development of a marina which will put more traffic on a narrow road. There is inadequate access to the proposed site for 45 houses and the increase in traffic will cause more burden on Send Road which is frequently solid with cars.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/408  Respondent: 8594721 / Mr Peter Eperon  Agent:
I object the A42: Clockbarn Nurseries, Tannery Lane.

This lane is also very narrow and, because of recent Marina approval it will make access into Send Road even more dangerous.

To summarise:
All these proposals are being built on what was green belt and it seems extremely underhand by moving the green belt boundary Jines. This goes against the Secretary of State guidelines and Government planning Minister. A letter received received from Sir Paul Beresford in July, 2014 stated that only in exceptional circumstances could properties be built on green belt land. These proposals could be built on brown fields and do not show special reasons for green belt building. With reference to Send Hill development this a complete residential area and could not cope with a large increase in traffic including commercial lorries being used by travellers. However the Clock Barn site is more suitable for commercial vehicles. I am also surprised that Ewbanks brown belt site was suddenly abandoned as it would seem more appropriate for industrial usage and homes. I would be most interested to know how and why this occurred and the other sites suggested were put in at the last moment before the meeting on 24th May. This gives very short notice for discussion.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of State, Ministry of Planning, our local Member of Parliament and Prime Minister, David Cameron.

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

Attached documents:

In specific terms, I objected to the original proposal to build 45 homes in Tannery Lane, which is narrow and twisting, with a junction in the village that is often difficult to negotiate, and Tannery Lane itself already serves as a terrifying drive or walk for locals with goods vehicles, vans and the like coming from and going to the industrial units by the Wey. Guilford's response to this is to INCREASE the number of homes being considered. I therefore also object to Policy A42; a one-third sized increase in the number of houses now being proposed and I fail to see how this increase will improve the traffic at the junction in the village I have already objected to. We are already in danger of losing countryside views from the banks of the Wey, and this development will be fully visible from the towpath. Any housing in this low-lying area will obviously affect the situation with drainage, and may cause flooding in the locality on a more frequent basis, or in residential areas that do not currently flood.

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

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

15. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2987  Respondent: 8598561 / Sarah Belton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 - both to the original 45 homes and the latest increase to 60 homes, on the basis that it is on greenbelt land; that local roads are unsuitable and unable due to existing congestion to take further traffic increases, in particular the A247 Send Road. Tannery Lane is a narrow lane requiring single lane traffic in parts and unsuitable for increased traffic flow. I am also aware as a resident of Send for 14 years, that the proposed site in Tannery Lane is low-lying and subject to flooding, as are a number of other areas in Send and Send Marsh, and hence it is entirely unsuitable for housing.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2393  Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• It will increase access and traffic problems on Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
• The housing proposed has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2281  Respondent: 8600929 / Roger Newland  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/881</th>
<th>Respondent: 8601121 / Roger Collett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The latest changes to the proposals to inset villages into the green belt are only minimal whilst the principle of insetting is not adequately substantiated and is objected to in principle. There is no protection for open areas within the villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The plan continues to be contrary to the principles of the green belt in that it proposes urban spread along the A3 corridor. The proposals at Three Farms Meadows, Wisley; Garlces Arch, Send; Gosden Hill, Burpham/Merrow and the housing towards the Hogs Back will break down the Green Belt along the A3. Any changes are only minor and there remains no special circumstances to support this development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The plan still fails to explain the methodology behind the housing numbers and whilst making minimal changes these in no way reflect the constraints that could be applied given the proportion of green belt within the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Policy A 42 &amp; Policy 2 para 4.3.15 – I object to these policies as Tannery Lane cannot support additional housing or commerce, it is a narrow country lane set in an attractive green belt area close to the Wey Navigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/848</th>
<th>Respondent: 8604481 / Mr Steve Minter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( Yes ) , is Sound? ( Yes ) , is Legally Compliant? ( Yes )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the demonstrable need for additional housing in the village, i believe this proposal is sensible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/535</th>
<th>Respondent: 8606081 / Susan Greenman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My detailed objections are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much. It also ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people and it will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village even worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am writing to file my strong objections to the following amendments made to the Local Plan.

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42:

I object to Policy A42 as the number of homes planned has been increased from 45 to 60 homes. This is an increase of 33% and ignores all previous objections from local residents.

Tannery Lane is a single track narrow lane which has traffic and access problems onto the A247. Send Business Park traffic is already a problem without increasing this by more homes.

The Policy will erode more Green Belt. As Guildford Borough Council is a Conservative Constituency who promised not to build on Green Belt - this is totally unacceptable.

There is surface water flooding in this area and building homes on this land will add to the problem.

The countryside around Send will be lost and the rural feel of the area which is part of the attraction of Send.

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

Attached documents:
The visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1395</th>
<th>Respondent: 8656417 / Allan Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 of the Local Plan because you have ignored my original objection and increased the number of houses from 45 to 60 houses. This will further increase the traffic entering Send Barnes Road. This road and intersection is already too narrow to take the existing traffic. The footpath at the nearby traffic lights is far too narrow, this footpath is used by mothers and children on the way to and from school. The path is so narrow that mothers cannot walk side by side. This is an accident black spot about to happen. This development is a further erosion of the green belt, which the Prime minister has said will not happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6166</th>
<th>Respondent: 8657697 / Jean O'Connor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery Lane, this a a very narrow and winding lane, how it will cope with commercial and residential development in such a tight roadway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2581</th>
<th>Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the increase in housing on this site. Tannery Lane is a very narrow lane and will not be able to cope with the traffic congestion. Furthermore, the whole village of Send has terrible congestion as it is used as a Rat Run for cars coming from Woking, joining the A3, any further developments in Send will add to this congestion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2878  Respondent: 8732321 / John Freeland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to 45 new houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate road capacity for access

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7437  Respondent: 8732321 / John Freeland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

1. I OBJECT to 45 new houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate road capacity for access

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/827  Respondent: 8734785 / Bill Houghton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because it will add a further burden to the A247 especially at its junction with Tannery Lane. This will have an worsening affect on traffic flow from the Old Woking t-junction all the way up to Clandon. It will also destroy the Green Belt nature of this area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1317  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

I object to this site because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. In one direction Tannery Lane is very narrow and twisty, being reduced to single lane traffic in many spots with passing places only; in the other junction onto Send Road is very dangerous and inadequate. Planning permission has already been given for a marina and 64 apartments which will
increase the traffic greatly. I request that my comments are shown to the Planning inspector who will decide on the Plan and also please confirm that you have received my objections. Thank you.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2468  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the changes in Policy A42, Ciockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send because the proposal is now for 60 homes instead of 45. Tannery Lane is not built to cope with a lot of traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3065  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the changes in Policy A42, Ciockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send because the proposal is now for 60 homes instead of 45. Tannery Lane is not built to cope with a lot of traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2221  Respondent: 8773217 / Russell Burgess  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1696  Respondent: 8775169 / Shaun Cheyne  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

(1) I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

The latest draft plan proposes 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more than previously proposed. This shows a completed disregard for the previous comments and objections of the community.

Now more homes than previously proposed means all impacts previously stated will be greater, including:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. Future access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
3. Erosion of the Green Belt in our village
4. Surface water flooding, which is already a problem, will become even worse
5. It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2424  Respondent: 8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane, A42. The housing at this site has been increased by a third since the 2016 plan. There are no proposed to improve the local road network (only to add more junctions with the A3). This region is already VERY congested and the failure to consider how to improve and support the local road network in relation to this increase in housing is senseless. This increase in housing should not be allowed.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/366  Respondent: 8800705 / Michael Cumper  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
A42 Clockbarn Nursery

There were thousands of objections to the original submission and these have been completed ignored. Rather than reconsidering the proposal in light of the objections the number of houses has been increased even more. The fact that this area is unable to sustain the increased traffic, erode the Green Belt further, add further problems to an area that already and seriously impact on the River Wey surrounding countryside.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2181  Respondent: 8803617 / Timothy Bruton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

2.1 A42 Clockbarn Nursery

I wish to object to this development. While this a brownfield site, my objection lies in the road access to the site. The junction of Tannery Road and Send Road is extremely narrow and will continue to be used by large lorries supplying the Tannery Business site. The road becomes single track beyond the Tannery. In addition to the narrowness many cars are parked close to the junction limiting site lines and causing difficulties in manoeuvrings (see figure 1)

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2145  Respondent: 8803617 / Timothy Bruton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I wish to object to the following policies affecting Send.

Site A42 -an increase of 15 new houses on the site

The demand for housing overall has decreased in the Local plan yet the number of houses in Send has increased. This site is down a single track lane with no pedestrian or cycle provision and is already busy with heavy vehicles attending the Send Business Centre.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3173  Respondent: 8805633 / Alena Thomas  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. Policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Allocated for 60 houses in place of the previous 45 houses. Apart from being lined both sides with green fields for much of its length, Tannery Lane is a narrow route turning off from the middle of Send and where it turns off there is existing development either side adding to the traffic turning into it will cause further delays through the middle of the village and require a significant amount of infrastructure work.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4126  Respondent: 8817121 / Celia Howard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

A42 I object to 60 houses on the sight of Clockbarn Nurseries.

The access from A247 into semi rural Tannery Lane is already hazardous and the lane in poor conditions and liable to flooding in places.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3901  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)
The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

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

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3932  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7118  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy 42 - the proposal to build houses at Clockbarn Nursery as access is already poor due to the narrowness of Tannery Lane & the poor junction with Send Road. This will be made worse when the proposed marina & apartments at the Tannery are built.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2249  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn Nursery as it increases the number of houses planned. The road junction with Tannery Lane is already very difficult & indeed just last week there was an accident there. Despite the number of houses being dropped in this new version of the Local Plan, the number planned for Send has been increased for no justifiable reason.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5623  Respondent: 8835809 / Richard Golding  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn NurseryThere is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable. The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7630  Respondent: 8837729 / Harry Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

1. Policy A42 (Send) – Object
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to OBJECT to the level of development proposed for Site A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.

Tannery Lane is prone to surface water flooding, and the development of 45 new houses on this small plot of land would result in increased traffic along this narrow lane (single track in parts, without pedestrian pavements along most of its length), which is already under stress from existing traffic flows.

I do not believe that there is adequate space on this site to provide the number of houses proposed and adequate parking for its residents. The lack of sufficient car parking will result in more parking problems in the village. As public transport is poor in the village, it is likely that each of the houses will require one, if not two cars. If we take an average of 1.5 cars per house (which is the average level of car ownership in Guildford Borough, according to the 2011 Census), this would mean and additional 67.5 additional cars from this development. Given a very conservative estimate of one return journey a day for each of those cars, this would result in at least an extra 135 car moments on this already congested and narrow lane.

This level of development is inappropriate for this site and should be significantly reduced.

I would like the Inspector to see this comment.

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

**Attached documents:**

2) I OBJECT to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane

I, along with hundreds of other residents as well as Send Parish Council have already objected to the earlier number of 45 homes on this site in the previous version of the plan. Incredibly, the current version of the plan actually proposes to increase the number of homes on this site to 60, a further increase of 33%, showing complete disregard to previous comments. I object to the designation of this site for 60 homes.

This site is prone to surface water flooding and this level of development will only make it worse.

Tannery Lane is a single lane track in points and traffic is already busy on the junction of Tannery Lane and A247. An extra 240 car journeys per day (60 x 2 cars x 1 return trip) from this location will exacerbate existing congestion in this narrow toad and in particular on this corner.

This particular plot is within Green Belt and thus development here within Green Belt, or changing the Green Belt boundary will be contrary to one of the important functions of Green Belt which is to provide separation between villages. No 'exceptional circumstances' exist to justify the development of this site.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3874  Respondent: 8839521 / Lynn Yeo  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt, Policy A42

This is effectively an old non-conforming user in an area of outstanding countryside adjacent to the beautiful Wey Navigation. Further expansion or development at this location detracts from the openess of the Green Belt and is inappropriate. It is in a high sensitivity area of Green Belt on the banks of the River Wey, opposite some water meadows, adjacent to a Conservation Area and close to a SSSI. It is not clear why the ‘high sensitivity’ Green Belt designation given to this site in the 2016 version of the plan has been removed in order to inset Send Business Centre and the adjoining land from the Green Belt. I object to the removal of this site from the Green Belt.

There is highly restricted vehicular access along Tannery Lane in both directions. This road narrows to a single lane track in sections and would not be able to cope with any significant increase in vehicular traffic.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4333  Respondent: 8839553 / David Burnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I am writing to OBJECT to the development proposed for Site A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.

It is unclear whether the houses proposed here are in addition to the existing shed / warehouse based businesses that are here, or instead of.

The site currently has derelict green houses, but this does not mean that the site is brown field – in fact the site is high value green belt land. Any development here should not be to the detriment of the character of the area, and should have particular regard to the Corridor of the River Wey conservation area (which this site sits within, and your plan document titled: Guildford_borough_Proposed_Submission_Local_Plan_-_strategy_and_sites_compressed.pdf fails to mention).

Tannery Lane is prone to surface water flooding, and the development of 45 new houses on this small plot of land would not help. Placing housing here would result in increased traffic along this narrow lane (single track in parts, without pedestrian pavements along most of its length), which is already under stress from existing traffic flows.

I do not believe that there is adequate space on this site to provide the number of houses proposed and adequate parking for its residents. The lack of sufficient car parking will result in more parking problems in the village. As public transport is poor in the village, it is likely that each of the houses will require one, if not two cars. If we take an average of 1.5 cars per house (which is the average level of car ownership in Guildford Borough, according to the 2011 Census), this would mean and additional 67.5 additional cars from this development. Given a very conservative estimate of one return journey a day for each of those cars, this would result in at least an extra 135 car moments on this already congested and narrow lane.
In developing this site in its entirety Guildford Borough Council are missing an opportunity to connect the River Wey Navigation to the village, either via Tannery Lane or Wharf Lane – via footpath or recreation ground – which would provide much needed leisure and fitness opportunities close to nature.

This part of Send has very little or nil street lighting – thus wildlife has flourished due to the adjacent field, hedgerows, meadows, and river Wey. I have seen bats, owls, deer, and many magnificent birds crossing in the vicinity of this plot. I would not like to see this impacted in any way.

The sewer system in Send already cannot cope with the level of housing and the new Vision Engineering factory and several of the newer developments are already pumping out their sewage at night. I don’t see how 45 houses will help the situation.

This level of development is inappropriate for this site and should be significantly reduced.

I would like the Inspector to see this comment.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2548  **Respondent:** 8839553 / David Burnett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to changes to Guildford’s Draft Local Plan, which call for an increase in the number of houses at Clockbarn Nursery from 45 to 60 houses.

I objected when 45 houses were proposed here. More housing has been approved along Tannery Lane (04/P/00576) and has yet to be built. Already the junction between Tannery Lane and Send Road cannot cope.

This particular plot is within Green Belt and thus development here within Green Belt, or changing the Green Belt boundary will be contrary to one of the important functions of Green Belt which is to provide separation between villages.

It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.

It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

Vehicular access to this site is poor, as it is along a narrow section of Tannery Lane.

There are industrial units on this site and it is unclear from this policy’s proposal whether these will stay or go, making the use of this site unclear (poor planning).

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

**Attached documents:**
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane - Policy A42 I object to the proposal that the number of homes should be increased to 60 for the following reasons:-

- Tannery Lane is narrow and has poor visibility
- The A247 is a very busy road and problems at the junction with Tannery Lane will be considerably worse

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1001</th>
<th>Respondent: 8848033 / Paul Gerrard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to housing on this site. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2755</th>
<th>Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more vehicle movements.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7593</th>
<th>Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more vehicle movements.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6613  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2494  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will be a disaster for the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3030  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will be a disaster for the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is
most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to
improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local
road network.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42) The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner
includes on page 5: "We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities
and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of
new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”. The lack of any plan for either physical or green
infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery,
Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the
stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8021  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

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

The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of
the surrounding area.

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing
access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of
the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina.
Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4305  Respondent: 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

23 POLICY A42 CLOCKBARN NURSERY
23.1 I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes.

23.2 It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.

23.3 The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.

23.4 It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

23.5 It will make erosion of Green Belt in our village worse.

23.6 It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.

23.7 It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

23.8 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

23.9 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most of its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

23.10 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

23.11 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

23.12 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7311  **Respondent:** 8859585 / Claire Yates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

- Send has already played a committed and valuable part in providing housing, over the last 25 years a substantial amount of houses and flats have been built in Send.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, because Tannery Lane is a very narrow lane with a hazardous junction onto Send Road. Planning has already been granted for 64 apartments and the Marina, which will be using the same road, both of which will generate heavy traffic and that has a hazardous junction onto Send Road, with bad site lines for drivers.

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

**Attached documents:**

Comment ID: pslp172/3319  **Respondent:** 8859585 / Claire Yates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery because:

• Send Road is already an extremely busy road, very heavily congested with traffic, more housing at Tannery Lane will increase traffic and pollution in Send Road.
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/167  Respondent: 8864961 / David Mayne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 - Part 2: Sites

A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

I object to the fact that there is very limited potential for adequate access to this site onto Tannery Lane and Send Road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4345  Respondent: 8865665 / David Williams  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

In addition to my concerns written to you on 18 July 2016 I wish to register further objections to the following amended policies that directly affect our community in Send:

1. Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

Guildford Council has recently approved the development of a major new Marina development on Tannery Lane, in addition to the existing commercial operations at Send Business Park. Tannery Lane is a narrow, twisty, single track road with blind access to the A247 Send Road. This is already a dangerous and congested junction. The previous 2016 proposal A42 for 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery was already unsuitable for this location. The proposed increase from 45 to 60 houses on this site will:

• clearly exacerbate all the previous planning objections for this site – traffic congestion and pressure on sewage infrastructure.
• In addition the extra houses will substantially increase pressure on parking and hence on service and emergency access e.g. ambulance transport for elder residents.
• This increase may appear trivial but is irresponsible for the welfare of new and existing residents in the neighbourhood.
• The development is proposed before the infrastructure impact of the new Marina can be assessed.

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

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2328</th>
<th>Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT to policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. The number of planned houses here has increased by a third which is too much. Tannery lane is narrow and winding and will not be able to cope with the extra traffic especially with the additional traffic that will also be generated when the new marina opens.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1459</th>
<th>Respondent: 8876257 / Peter S Cliff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A42 Tannery Lane Send:-</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2175</th>
<th>Respondent: 8879937 / Dietlinde Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42), up by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp172/2220</td>
<td>Respondent: 8880385 / John Telfer</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane I object to Policy A42 changes by the increase if 33% more homes i.e. 60 new proposed from 45. This proposal ignores all the previous objections, worsens traffic problems at the junction with A247 (Send Road) which is already heavily congested with vehicles going from Woking to Burnt Common roundabout and to Ripley, Guildford and M25. The lane is so narrow in places two cars cannot comfortable pass and is also the access route to the proposed marina.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1631</th>
<th>Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn because Tannery Lane is far too narrow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/956</th>
<th>Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Clandon, Ripley and Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no confidence in the local plan and request that it be properly thought through, reworked and revised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2874</th>
<th>Respondent: 8886945 / Brian Osborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to A42 Clockbam Nursery Tannery Lane. I have previously objected in 2016 to building 40 houses but this has now be increased to 60. My objections to the 2016 plan remain valid. Site A42 is not sustainable for building houses as Tannery Lane and Papercourt Lane's are narrow and cannot cope with this number of homes being built in addition to a Narrowboat Basin which has been approved and is only accessible by Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7658  Respondent: 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

1.1 We object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

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

1.3 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

1.4 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

1.5 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

1.6 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

1.7 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/933  Respondent: 8897377 / Jan Jewers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

SITE A42 TANNERY LANE, SEND

The increase from 45 to 60 new homes. This may seem small but with poor public transport in the area every home will be reliant on cars.

Why does GBC continue to ignore the people they serve? Concentrating most of the development in the NE of the borough is a recipe for traffic disaster and poor air quality. Why not spread the housing throughout the borough equally?
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/280  Respondent: 8899169 / Michael Jordan  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because instead of reducing demands the GBC have chosen to increase the number of new home by a third. All previous reasons for objection have been ignored making far worse the present access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction. Send must retain its Green Belt and not add to the problems of surface flooding during parts of the year.

The river Wey Navigational Canal which flows through Send is a natural beauty and views for walking in open countryside. This must not be impacted further.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1716  Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to the development at Clockbam Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow, winding and already suffers heavy vehicle movements for the industrial units. The proposed 45 houses, together with the 65 houses already approved, will create a traffic nightmare at the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2614  Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to the Policy A42 change at Clockharn Nursery in Tannery Lane
The addition of a further 15 residential units to a total of 60 units with the consequent increase in traffic in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction.
The effect of addition people on the local schools and Doctor's surgery.
The destruction of the Green Belt by this development.
The increase in surface water flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object the A42 Clockbarn Nurseries, Tannery Lane.

This lane is also very narrow and, because of recent Marina approval, will make access into Send Road even more dangerous.

To summarise:
All these proposals are being built on what was green belt and seems extremely underhand by moving the green belt boundary lines. This goes against the Secretary of State guide lines and Government planning Minister. A letter received from Sir Paul Beresford in July, 2014, stated that only in exceptional circumstances could properties be built on green belt land. These proposals could be built on brown fields and do not show special reasons for green belt building. With reference to Send Hill development this is a complete residential area and could not cope with a large increase in traffic including commercial lorries used by travellers. However the Clockbarn site is more suitable for commercial vehicles. I am also surprised that Ewbanks brown belt site was suddenly abandoned as it would seem more appropriate for industrial usage and homes. I would be most interested to know how and why this occurred and the other sites suggested were put in at the last moment before the meeting on the 24th May. This gives very short notice for discussion.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of State, Ministry of Planning, our local Member of Parliament and Prime Minister, David Cameron.

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

Attached documents:
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections submitted by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic flow in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction, which suffers from excess traffic flow when the A3 is blocked – a frequent occurrence
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2893  Respondent: 8911873 / Tamsin Meredith  Agent:

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3172  Respondent: 8913985 / Lynda Newland  Agent:

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane.
Further increase in the number of proposed houses will increase traffic problems through Send and along Tannery Lane which is a narrow minor road.

It also erodes into the Green belt in the village and ignores all the previous objections.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2311  **Respondent:** 8914049 / Diana Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

**Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send (page 219)**

I object to this development because the additional traffic from that development coupled with the traffic from the new marina with 80 berths which you have agreed further down Tannery Lane which is mainly a single lane with passing places.

The Marina was identified as a high priority requirement and something the village apparently ‘had to have’. Having spoken to many locals, it would appear that this would have been so far down their list of requirements to actually not be on the list at all! It was a travesty the development was voted through by GBC when clearly there were valid objections.

These same objections remain and will be compounded by the inclusion of the Clockbarn nursery site. This additional traffic will be unable safely to join the much overused main road through Send. This road is the main through road from Woking to the A3 and M25 which is already used to capacity especially by articulated trucks and heavy vehicles for which the road was never designed. Additional traffic joining from Tannery Lane would have great difficulty and any attempt to ease the problem with a roundabout or traffic lights would simply exacerbate the situation.

The access point is so narrow it would clearly be a safety hazard and a potential accident black spot. Vehicles would not be able to join the main road and so would back up along Tannery Lane at peak times. This would be really dangerous and if there was an emergency then the necessary services would be unable to gain access to the site and attend the incident and this could have serious consequences.

GBC has a responsibility to its residents to ensure proposed developments meet highways safety standards and I fail to see how an access point at a narrow junction of Send Road and Tannery Lane will meet this.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4249  **Respondent:** 8914049 / Diana Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

1. **POLICY A42 Pages 241-2**
I object to the proposed increase of a further 16 houses on the Clockbarn Nursery site. This is a totally unsuitable site anyway for a high density development. Your proposal to increase the number of houses completely exacerbates the situation further.

Traffic movements from the site coupled with traffic accessing the new Marina development and then trying to join Send Road would cause considerable problems for residents and through-traffic alike. To access Send Road from Tannery Lane is very limited at the best of times currently, and trying to join it with your proposals, particularly at peak times, would be even more difficult.

Pollution concerns: Send Road is already used to capacity by traffic heading to and from Junction 10 on the M25 and is used as a rat run off these roads. Send Road and the narrow lanes and roads close by were never intended to be used by today’s very large articulated trucks. The essential traffic islands to enable pedestrians to cross Send Road represent an additional hazard plus the increasing number of cyclists exposed to rising levels of exhaust pollution.

Access from the opposite end of Tannery Lane is through very narrow roads with limited passing areas means this access is impossible. The traffic from the Marina and the Clockbarn Nursery site would be forced to come and go via the Send Road junction thus making driving and access even more impossible!

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2484</th>
<th>Respondent: 8923905 / Claire Bridges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send (page219)

I object to this development because of the additional traffic that will be generated from that development. Coupled with the traffic from the new marina with 80 berths which you have agreed further down Tannery Lane, this will create a completely unmanageable level of traffic both in the volume and size of vehicles trying to pass along a very narrow country road which is mainly a single lane with passing places.

The Marina was identified as a high priority requirement and something the village apparently 'had to have'. Having spoken to many locals, it would appear that this would have been so far down their list of requirements to actually not be on the list at all! It was a travesty the development was voted through by GBC when clearly there were valid objections and once again, as with many of the other sites proposed, raises questions about the democratic decision making processes at GBC.

These same objections remain and will be compounded by the inclusion of the Clockbarn nursery site. This additional traffic will be unable safely to join the much overused main road through Send. This road is the main through road from Woking to the A3 and M25 which is already used to capacity especially by articulated trucks and heavy vehicles for which the road was never designed. Additional traffic joining from Tannery Lane would have great difficulty and any attempt to ease the problem with a roundabout or traffic lights would simply exacerbate the situation.

The access point is so narrow it would clearly be a safety hazard and a potential accident black spot. Vehicles would not be able to join the main road and so would back up along Tannery Lane at peak times. This would be really dangerous and if there was an emergency then the necessary services would be unable to gain access to the site and attend the incident and this could have serious consequences.

GBC has a responsibility to its residents to ensure proposed developments meet highways safety standards and Ifailto see how an access point at a narrow junction of Send Road and Tannery Lane will meet this.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7682  Respondent: 8923905 / Claire Bridges  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send (page219)

I object to this development because of the additional traffic that will be generated from that development. Coupled with the traffic from the new marina with 80 berths which you have agreed further down Tannery Lane, this will create a completely unmanageable level of traffic both in the volume and size of vehicles trying to pass along a very narrow country road which is mainly a single lane with passing places.

The Marina was identified as a high priority requirement and something the village apparently ‘had to have’. Having spoken to many locals, it would appear that this would have been so far down their list of requirements to actually not be on the list at all! It was a travesty the development was voted through by GBC when clearly there were valid objections and once again, as with many of the other sites proposed, raises questions about the democratic decision making processes at GBC.

These same objections remain and will be compounded by the inclusion of the Clockbarn nursery site. This additional traffic will be unable safely to join the much overused main road through Send. This road is the main through road from Woking to the A3 and M25 which is already used to capacity especially by articulated trucks and heavy vehicles for which the road was never designed. Additional traffic joining from Tannery Lane would have great difficulty and any attempt to ease the problem with a roundabout or traffic lights would simply exacerbate the situation.

The access point is so narrow it would clearly be a safety hazard and a potential accident black spot. Vehicles would not be able to join the main road and so would back up along Tannery Lane at peak times. This would be really dangerous and if there was an emergency then the necessary services would be unable to gain access to the site and attend the incident and this could have serious consequences.

GBC has a responsibility to its residents to ensure proposed developments meet highways safety standards and I fail to see how an access point at a narrow junction of Send Road and Tannery Lane will meet this.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3841  Respondent: 8923905 / Claire Bridges  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A42 Pages 241-2

I object to the proposed increase of a further 16 houses on the Clockbarn Nursery site. This is a totally unsuitable site for a high density development. Increasing the number of houses completely exacerbates the situation.
Traffic movements from the site in addition to the traffic accessing the new Marina development and then trying to join Send Road would cause considerable problems for residents and through-traffic alike. Access from Tannery Lane to Send Road is very limited and trying to join it, particularly at peak times, is extremely difficult.

Send Road is already used to capacity by traffic heading to and from Junction 10 on the M25 and is used as a rat run off these roads. Send Road was never intended to be used by today’s very large articulated trucks.

The essential traffic islands to enable pedestrians to cross represent an additional hazard plus the increasing number of cyclists exposed to rising levels of exhaust pollution.

Access from the opposite end of Tannery Lane is through very narrow country roads with limited passing areas which will render this access effectively impossible. This means that traffic from the Marina and the Clockbarn Nursery site would be forced to come and go via the Send Road junction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3676  Respondent: 8926529 / Annie Cross  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 – Clockbarn Nursery

1. I object: to the amended plan increasing the number of homes on this site. The access to Send Road is poor whilst the access to Newark Lane, along the very narrow, windy, Papercourt Lane with its many blind bends, is dreadful.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3961  Respondent: 8931233 / John Pemberton  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 changes at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because

- The increase to 60 homes ignores the hundreds of previous objections.
- It ignores the obvious traffic problems, mostly on single track roads, between Tannery Lane and the A247 junction.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4993  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:  

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

I object to the building of 45 homes on the site of Clockbarn Nursery. The land is Grade 1 Agricultural Land and should be used accordingly. So far as I can see, no allowance at all has been made in the Local Plan for the increased food consumption required to feed the additional mouths implied by the 693 homes per year foreseen by the plan. Also, there is already inadequate access to the various buildings and industrial sites along Tannery Lane and the junction with Send Road is hazardous to the extent that significant amounts of traffic access the other end of Tannery Lane via Send Marsh Road and Polesden Lane. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at The Tannery and for the building of a Marina. Enough is enough; Tannery Lane can take no more.

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

Comment ID: pslp172/1029  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a devastating impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send and Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Comment ID: pslp172/3716  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes.

It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people

The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.

It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

It will make erosion of Green Belt worse.

It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.
It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most of its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/130  **Respondent:** 9247745 / Keir Barrie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

As for the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley, where we live.

Please think again and do not spoil our Greenbelt.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3917  **Respondent:** 9323361 / Paul Holden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

- I object to housing development at Clockbarn Nursery,

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/372  **Respondent:** 10447777 / J Jordan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/454</th>
<th>Respondent: 10540161 / Shelagh Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because instead of reducing demands the GBC have chosen to increase the number of new home by a third. All previous reasons for objection have been ignored making far worse the present access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction. Send must retain its Green Belt and not add to the problems of surface flooding during parts of the year. The river Wey Navigational Canal which flows through Send is a natural beauty and views for walking in open countryside. This must not be impacted further.

The road along Tannery lane is so narrow cars have to stop and allow oncoming cars to pass in places.

Lorries jam up now, more will be ridiculous.

Any further development here is most unacceptable.

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

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3506</th>
<th>Respondent: 10543937 / Sarah Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A42 – Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. I strongly object to the change of increasing the number of homes in the draft local plan. As in my comments in the paragraph above, this is in an area of natural beauty and it will be destroyed by building upon it. The traffic infrastructure simply cannot take it. Send and Ripley are already gridlocked during a high percentage of each week as it is!

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

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane due to the following points:

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is single track for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical with 45 homes, so an increase of 33% is just ridiculous.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with traffic for 45 extra homes, so an increase is not going to work.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. The traffic for this development has not yet been added to the current traffic situation.
The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane, so an increase in homes just exacerbates the problem.

This change ignores hundreds of previous objections. These have been made by people who live locally, the people who know the area best, they should be listened to, not pushed to one side.

Surface water flooding will be increased with the original number of homes, additional homes will make the situation worse still.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6933  Respondent: 10551617 / L Truscott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to policy A42 Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane this site is classified as agricultural in the green belt. Access is unsuitable either way you whether off Send Road which is very busy and congested at peak times or via Papercourt Lane which is narrow. Tannery Lane itself is a very narrow bendy lane with poor sight lines and under pressure from existing traffic as there are many places that two cars cannot pass each other, the lane has no pedestrian footpath apart from a narrow uneven pavement at the top of the lane, the lane is prone to flooding. We have to consider planning application 04/P/00576 for 64 apartments already approved with the addition of these suggested 45 it would result in an increase of 500%. Also the recent approved application 16/P/002289 land to the north of Tannery Lane and east of Wharf Lane is noted that the nursery to the west of this site is Clockarn site A42 provides foraging habitat for bats. This would appear as a mitigation measure for approval of 16/P/02289 and it would not now be appropriate to destroy this wildlife corridor to the west of the marina development by building houses on the site.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3968  Respondent: 10551617 / L Truscott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery as I did previously and feel that to increase the number of homes from 45 to 60 in this draft and at this location after previous objections is unacceptable. Tannery Lane is a narrow lane at either end with no pavement apart from 250 metres on one side from the entrance off the A247 and many of the homes have no off street parking and park on the road causing passing problems to vehicles using Tannery Lane. The junction of Tannery Lane with the A247 is dangerous despite the recent addition of double yellow lines as the sight lines pulling out are very bad, this will worsen with the increased traffic from the proposed houses. The infrastructure of the A247 is at full capacity during rush hour with traffic queues and busy throughout the whole day any additional traffic will worsen this problem. Tannery Lane suffers from problems with Lorries and cars trying to pass on route to the Send Business Park, this will also become busier as the recent planning application for the Marina was passed and work has started. I have concerns for the Flora, fauna and wildlife in this area such as bats, deer, foxes and many different species of birds. This development could have an impact on the countryside and could affect the view from the Wey Navigation. Finally Tannery Lane is prone to flooding and this would need to be addressed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1533</th>
<th>Respondent: 10551841 / N C and N O Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane. The proposal of a further 15 houses on what was already an unsuitable site on a narrow country lane in the Green Belt shows that the concerns of the many objectors have been ignored. Access and traffic problems in the Lane itself and onto the A247 will be exacerbated. The Green Belt is being further eroded and the nature of Send as a village would be changed. Flooding, which is already an issue would likely to be made worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to formally lodge my objections to GBC's latest draft local plan. I have objected, as have a large number of others, on a number of grounds in the past bit I am appalled to see that not only have these legitimate concerns not been taken into account in the latest draft plan but indeed Send appears to have been earmarked to take addional housing provision. It is very cynical to remove areas previously designated Green Belt in and around Send to conveniently accommodate GBC's massive housing plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3493</th>
<th>Respondent: 10563457 / John Creasey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nurseries of 45 houses as Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take a large amount of traffic. The marina will already increase the traffic on this road plus the 64 houses which have already been approved. Tannery lane/Send Road junction is already very busy and dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1218</th>
<th>Respondent: 10563777 / Hazel Creasey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO POLICY A42 because you have increased the number of houses to be built from 45 to 60, an increase of 33%. There were a lot of objections to the original number so why increase it? I feel this increase is unacceptable and will lead to a considerable increase in traffic on an already extremely busy road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3136</td>
<td>Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A42 - I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. It is also subject to The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/604</th>
<th>Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A42 - I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. It is also subject to The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/622</th>
<th>Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from 45 homes (previously) to 60 homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a 33% increase in a small location, which is excessive and ignores hundreds of previous objections by local people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make worse the traffic problems in the narrow and winding Tannery Lane. There has already been a successful application for 64 houses at the Marina further down Tannery Lane and another application is pending to build houses on the garage site on the corner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The junction with Tannery Lane and the A247 Send Road is notoriously difficult to negotiate. The bad surface water flooding in the Lane will become worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It will adversely affect the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1944  Respondent: 10581825 / A D Sussex  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT that Send is being asked to take a disproportionate number of the now houses that we need in the Borough. Rather than reducing the numbers put upon Send in the Plan, THE 2017 PLAN INCREASES THE NUMBER STEEP FURTHER.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1951  Respondent: 10581825 / A D Sussex  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

LAND AT CLOCKBARN NURSERY, TANNERY LANE, POLICY A42A.

I OBJECT to the proposed change of use because;
1. It totally ignores all previous objections when the proposal was for 45 houses and now proposes 60.
2. Access to Tannery Lane is very restricted from both ends and could not cope with all the traffic this development would generate.
3. It is out of keeping with the open country feel of this area and is what the Green Belt is all about.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/222  Respondent: 10616289 / Hilary Percy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Site A42 Tannery Lane

Increasing housing density will damage the local rural environment and add yet more motor traffic to our congested local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1166</th>
<th>Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4221</th>
<th>Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6054</th>
<th>Respondent: 10644417 / D Hill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, the Tannery Lane proposal of 45 homes would bring the already grid locked Send Road (at peak times) to a halt as a potential 90 additional cars turning onto Send Road would cause traffic chaos.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/47  Respondent: 10677665 / Clare McCann  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I have written in the past objecting to the disproportionate development being planned for Send and I gather that despite receiving over 10,000 objections, the new plan continues to 'target' Send and that we are only 'allowed' to comment on changes. Proposal A42 Clockbarn Nursery has an increased density of housing -up a third even though it has been pointed out repeatedly that Tannery lane is not suitable for an increase in traffic as it is narrow, with poor sight lines meaning it is often hard to see on-coming traffic. In addition to the traffic issue there is the problem of local services which are at full capacity now and cannot sustain a substantial increase in the village population -there seems to be no mention of school places, doctors etc.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2221  Respondent: 10683457 / Margaret Bruton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

2.3 A42 Clockbarn Nursery

I wish to object to this development. While this a brownfield site, my objection lies in the road access to the site. The junction of Tannery Road and Send Road is extremely narrow and will continue to be used by large lorries supplying the Tannery Business site. The road becomes single track beyond the Tannery. In addition to the narrowness many cars are parked close to the junction limiting site lines and causing difficulties in manoeuvrings (see figure 1)

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1674  Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 houses in place of 45 homes is not in keeping with the rural area and Tannery Lane is very narrow and is not sufficiently wide enough to carry the significant increase in traffic. It is already treacherous at points along the lane and it will impact the open countryside views and will unnecessarily erode the Green Belt status of the area. The Marina development has already been given the go ahead and the area cannot cope with more building development.

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn. There is inadequate access and this would create an excessive and unsupportable increase in traffic volume. This would become more hazardous for people trying to access the main road and leave the lane. Tannery Lane is obviously unable to accommodate the volume of traffic that would result.

I object to this change as it is undemocratic - the proposed increase disregards (and indeed flies in the face of) the many objections previously made by local people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1661</th>
<th>Respondent: 10718625 / Zareena Linney</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because it is a third more home then the original proposal, Tannery Lane itself is very narrow and very prone to flooding, beside the gridlock and pollution you will be causing on the already congested roads, and also impacting on the open countryside to impacts of pollution and building. It puts a strain on the infrastructure when no planning, extra traffic causes traffic to our houses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/77</th>
<th>Respondent: 10719233 / Martin O'Donohue</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to Clockburn Nursery increase in size in respect of the additional traffic which it will cause, combined with traffic to and from Send Business Park plus the Marina to be built resulting in chaos trying to exit and enter Tannery Lane from Send Road the problems currently encountered with Artic’s delivering to the Business Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to Send Business Park being removed from the greenbelt it’s bad enough now the traffic is a major problem the area looks a shambles do we have live like this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1610</th>
<th>Respondent: 10721089 / Y Beraud</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to withstand any further volumes of traffic. The junction with Send Road is already hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning has already been granted for 64 apartments and a marina in Tannery Lane both of which will generate additional traffic and even more pollution.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3033  Respondent: 10721121 / L Beraud  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Tannery Lane because the proposed increase of homes is much too much, also it ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people. The traffic and access problems will increase in tannery lane and at the A247 junction also it will make an erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse, there is at present surface water flooding and this proposal will make the situation worse and also it will impact open countryside views from the the river Wey navigation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4010  Respondent: 10721473 / David French  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 Clock Barn Nursery - 45 houses. This, together with the 63 apartments already granted planning permission at the Tannery site, would increase traffic on Tannery Lane so much. The lane is already narrow and twisting, with many blind bends, and reduced width on several stretches. It is also liable to flooding. The junction with Send Road is very difficult to negotiate and cannot be improved because of width restrictions.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3538  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/532  **Respondent:** 10722593 / D.C. Johnson-Webb  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane because you have increased the number of homes from 45 to 60.

This ignores the previous objections made by local residents. Each home will have at least two cars, the roads are lanes, where do you propose all the extra traffic will go on already congested roads? The area floods already what happens to all the extra water draining from concreted drives and roads?

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/607  **Respondent:** 10722689 / D.M. Johnson-Webb  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane.

1) Increase of 45 houses to 60 ignoring all previous objections.
2) Each home will have at least two cars. Where will all the extra traffic go?
3) This area is floodplain with the whole area concreted over, where will the water go?

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2349  **Respondent:** 10723425 / Eileen Nolan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the increase in number of houses proposed for site A42 Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane. I have previously objected in 2016 to building 40 houses but this has now be increased to 60. My objections to the 2016 plan remain valid. Site A42 is not sustainable for building houses as Tannery Lane and Papercourt Lane's are narrow and cannot cope with this number of homes being built in addition to a Narrowboat Basin which has been approved and is only accessible by Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3036</th>
<th>Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because it reduces the Green Belt protection of the village. The number of houses proposed is too many (an increase of a third on what was indicated before) and will cause traffic issues - the local roads are already too clogged up and not suited to additional traffic levels and Tannery Lane itself would not be able to cope with further traffic. Local residents have already strongly objected to it- this has clearly been ignored when drawing up these changes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3599</th>
<th>Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because it reduces the Green Belt protection of the village. The number of houses proposed is too many (an increase of a third on what was indicated before) and will cause traffic issues - the local roads are already too clogged up and not suited to additional traffic levels and Tannery Lane itself would not be able to cope with further traffic. Local residents have already strongly objected to it- this has clearly been ignored when drawing up these changes.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3199</th>
<th>Respondent: 10724769 / P. Broughton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging.
into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1318  **Respondent:** 10724897 / Hilary Sewter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change because:

- Shows an increase of 15 houses on original 45.
- The housing demand number in the Local Plan has dropped by 39 houses per annum from 2018 – 2034. Despite this Send’s contribution has increased with no justification.
- It is an increase of 33% more and that is too much.
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

ABIDE BY ORIGINAL AND AGREED DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO BE LEGALLY COMPLIANT AND WITH REGARD TO ALL THE LOCAL SUBMISSIONS AND OBJECTIONS.

Policy A42 pages 241-2 in neither sound nor does it comply with the Duty to Co-operate.

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

ABIDE BY ORIGINAL AND AGREED DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO BE LEGALLY COMPLIANT AND WITH REGARD TO ALL THE LOCAL SUBMISSIONS AND OBJECTIONS.

Policy A42 pages 241-2 in neither sound nor does it comply with the Duty to Co-operate.

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/664  **Respondent:** 10725729 / Annie Hotson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I strongly object to Policy A42, You have ignored all previous objections and increased the numbers of dwellings to be built. The traffic in Send is already unmanageable at peak hours. This will worsen and our air quality will get even worse. Send Doctors and schools cannot be expected to maintain a good service for the increase in numbers.

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

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/661  **Respondent:** 10725793 / Ken Hotson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I strongly object to the revised Local plan Plicy A42: A43 :A58:Green belt policy 2 paragraph 4.3.15

My reason are that Send is a village and needs to remain that way, the increase from 45 to 60 dwellings in policy A42 is unfair and has ignored all the previous objections made by our local people.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1955</th>
<th>Respondent: 10726369 / A. Watson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Policy A42

I write to object to the above policy because of the increase in the number of houses intended for this site. Rather than listen to the hundreds of objections put to you last year that the number was too many, you have chosen to increase the number to 60. This shows you are really not listening. Increased traffic at the crossroads with the A247, particularly at busy times when children are walking alone or being walked to and from the local schools will make for a dangerous situation. Parking is already busy round that junction and additional traffic will create a gratuitous situation for accidents.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1222</th>
<th>Respondent: 10726497 / David Ian Ness</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

I object to the change of Policy A42 Tannery Lane, Send.

(Notification that the plan should be increased to building of 60 homes)

• This would be totally disproportionate to the original notification of 45 homes, and an increase of 33 %. I have objected to the earlier proposal anyway, the location of this site (in my opinion) is not even suitable to 45 homes. 10 maybe acceptable. This narrow lane is recognized locally as one of the remaining country lanes in Send. It has been in place for hundreds of years It has little infrastructure in place, is narrow road and not suited to any increase of traffic whatsoever

• Further down the lane, (which has no passing places at all) is a Trading Estate used by commercial vehicles. The building of a Marina on the River Wey is now in progress. As time goes on, this will also contribute to an increase in heavy vehicles using the lane.

• It would appear that the hundreds of previous objections by local people have been totally ignored.

• Should 60 houses be constructed (and excepting that most households now have more than one vehicle), it would raise traffic level to an excess amount attempting to join the A247 at peak times. Should the developers agree to pay for a traffic light controlled junction as a 'sweetener', consideration must be given to the fact that there is already traffic lights at the junction with Send Road and Send Barnes Lane. This would add to further traffic disruption (which is bad enough at the present time (the A247 being the main link road between the A3 and Woking)
• Pollution by car fumes would be substantially increased by queuing traffic.
• Also please bear in mind the safety of children attending Send First School and using the foot paths in Send.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/215  Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

However, I have no objection to the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/400  Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

However, I have no objection to the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5866  Respondent: 10727457 / Colin Eke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I OBJECT to the proposed development Clockbarn Nursery (policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5294  Respondent: 10727489 / Gaynor Eke  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed development Clockbarn Nursery (policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2523  Respondent: 10728449 / Jean Croucher  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object:

1. The land is green belt area and should not be used as residential

1. Tannery Lane is extremely narrow, winding and dangerous and is not at all suitable for increased traffic

Such a large percentage increase in the population of Send village is entirely inappropriate for such a small rural community with already difficult traffic issues, as well as being destructive to quiet recreational countryside areas and wildlife habitats.

Thank you for taking into account my objections

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2914  Respondent: 10729345 / M. Osborn  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane to building 60 houses. There are issues with groundwater flooding and it will make the junction with Tannery Lane and the main Send Road hazardous.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2451  Respondent: 10729537 / Julia Osborn  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to removing the Send Lakes from being a (Site of Nature Conservation Interest) SNCI status. Bats, Herons, Kingfishers and Hedgehogs are all part of the wildlife that can been seen in and around the lakes. The local plan should encourage this through policies aimed at preserving the lakes SNCI status as a part of the local plan’s environmental sustainability. It should not be removing them from SNCI sl.at.1 Js. The lakes act as an important ‘green lung”and wildlife corridor for the village.

I object to site A42 Oockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane. In recent documentation for planning application 14/P/02289 - Land to the north of Tannery Lane and east of Wharf Lane Send, surface water was considered an issue (see item 4.3 Noo technical Drainage report by Stilwell Partnership. In response a drainage strategy was submitted by Johns Associates proposing - Surface water run off is to be managed by digging deeper ditches around boundaries of the site, infiltration and attenuation ponds. This land adjoining site A42 Clockbam Nursery. The building of houses on Clockbam has potential to add pressure to land drainage and increasing the risk of surface water flooding. This scenario is not covered in GBC's Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) as this plan preceded approval of application 14/P/02289. The SWMP is a necessary part of the evidence base to ensure that Local Plans manage flood risk as required by the NPPF - but with regard to site A42 this is not covered by SWMP and this site is not compliant with NPPF requirements to manage flood risk from all sources.

Moreover, in the case officer report for approved application 14/P/02289 - Land to the north of Tannery Lane and east of Wharf Lane Send it is noted that the nursery to the west of this site (i.e. Clockbam Nursery, site A42) provides foraging habitat for bats. This would appear as a mitigation measure for approval of application 14/P/02289 and it would not now be appropriate to destroy this wildlife corridor to the west of the Marina development by building houses on the site.

I object to site A43a Burnt Common on and off slip roads to the A3. The traffic impact on the A247 through Send and Clandon and surrounding B roads would be immense. Air quality monitoring has not been undertaken on the A247 ahead of this proposal. This new road junction is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly.

I object to site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Bumtcornmon and Ripley and building 400 houses on th.is site as th.is site was not included in the initial consultation of the Draft Local Plan in 2014. This number of houses is out of scale and all proportion for a village settlement. Moreover, this area of land is identified as Green Belt within the evidence base document, Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Volume N (2014). See page 62. This site is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly.

I object to site A44 Send Hill. This site is a significant change between the Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation and people have not had opportunity to be involved or consulted accordingly. Moreover, this area of land is identified as Green Belt within the evidence base document, Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study - Volume N (2014).


I object to Gosden Hill site A25 (building 2000 houses) and I object to land at former Wisley Airfield site AJS (building 2000 houses) Both these developments are at odds with the sustainability corridor and the impact on junction 10 of the M25 would be enormous.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4002</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10729537 / Julia Osborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) **Object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane** to building 60 houses.

2.1) I object to the building of an even greater number of houses at site A42 because the draft Local Plan proposals **Jack a full Level 2, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of Tannery Lane** to consider the cumulative impact of all development proposals for this area of Send (i.e. the development of a Narrowboat Basin, proposed expansion of the Send Business Park and building an increased density of houses at Clockbarn Nursery.)

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF states “Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.” And that “Local Plans should be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and development policies to manage flood risk from all sources, taking account of advise from the Environment Agency …”

While Tannery Lane is outside of Flood Zone 3, these categories are based on Sea/River Flooding. To fully conform to NPPF guidance all sources of flooding need to be considered in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), including surface water and ground water flooding.

Evidence presented in relation to the Narrowboat basin application 14/P/02289 John Associates Environmental Statement Vol 8 Water, pages 27-28, reference British Geographical Survey Flood Data by Envirocheck which shows the areas of Send as having ‘high susceptibility’ to Groundwater (which includes Tannery Lane). Further, on page 32 of John Associates Environmental Statement Vol 8 Water, the Environment Agency has Groundwater monitoring borehole W02a, to the west of Prews Landfill site and to the east of the Narrowboat basin site and almost opposite to the house ‘Maybanks’ (which you can see via the map on page 33), as having recordings of shallow groundwater between 0.4 and 1.9 meters below ground. Site A42 Clockbarn Nursery is in the close proximity to the area of Tannery Lane.

2.2) I also object because it is overdevelopment for a small rural B classified road when a Narrowboat basin is already being constructed and expansion of the Business Park is proposed in this 2017 draft Local Plan. A full traffic assessment of Tannery Lane is needed in view of all proposals in this area of Send.

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

Attached documents:
• I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery, as the traffic would have to exit the site either via Tannery Lane – which is a single track road or via the traffic lights in Send, causing even further congestion in the area.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1369  Respondent: 10731361 / Joan Bagnall  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular I object to policy A42 with the increase of homes from the earlier proposal at Clockbarn Nursery site in Tannery Lane. This road is single track which would create congestion and further problems at the difficult junction with the A247 Send Road. On the assumption that each property would have at least one vehicle and the additional vehicles resulting from the construction of a marina further up the Lane this would be quite out of proportion. This would be a further incursion into the valuable green belt adjacent to the National Trust River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1108  Respondent: 10731937 / Carol Mullan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5045  Respondent: 10732097 / Gillian Thomas  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic. How planning permission was given for the marina, I do not know.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3869  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

7) I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries because the extra traffic generated by the building work and by probably 100 extra vehicles from residents of the new houses would bring circulation on Send Road (the A247) to an end at certain times of the day. Access to and from the proposed houses onto the A247 will be difficult particularly for large vehicles as is already shown by traffic accessing the former tannery buildings. The Send end of Tannery Lane is narrow and winding enough now to cause problems, but real problems will be caused by extra traffic trying to access the Newark Lane end of Tannery Lane which is barely wide enough for one vehicle and even more winding.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2413  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object because the previous plan to build 45 houses on the site was bad enough. The extra 15 houses now proposed will exacerbate the problems and shows contempt to the hundreds of Council taxpayers who previously objected to the 45 houses then proposed. No evidence has been produced to show that any houses are required here, especially for the extra number now proposed.

I object because access and traffic problems will be very much worse in Tannery Lane at the junction with the A247 in Send Road and totally disastrous at the Newark Lane junction. Tannery Lane for most of its length is winding and barely wide enough for one vehicle. There is no footpath and houses abut directly onto the road.

I object because the proposal will worsen erosion of the Green Belt in Send.

I object because surface water is already a serious problem and this proposal will make it very much worse.

I object because the proposal will detract from countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2291  Respondent: 10733089 / Chris Barber  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4427</th>
<th>Respondent: 10733121 / F. Buchhaus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery, as the traffic would have to exit the site either via Tannery Lane – which is a single track road onto Send Road which is already congested at school and commuting times, causing even further congestion in the area especially Burnt Common roundabout and Old Woking mini roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1569</th>
<th>Respondent: 10733409 / Ruth Hunter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send village being removed from the green belt, the building of 400 houses and industrial space at Garlicks Arch I object to 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1683</th>
<th>Respondent: 10733665 / David Elvey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 which ignores the hundreds of previous objections and will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction. These policies will all make the erosion of the Green Belt in villages worse and will negatively impact on the countryside, flooding on roads and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt and join up existing villages. The Council have behaved in an underhand way throughout and broken promises to the local electorate. Please reject these proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section page number
Page 64 of 327

Document page number
285
1. I object to the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery (Policy A42) because of poor access and traffic volume. Tannery lane is very narrow, has a tight junction with Send Road and will also have to accommodate extra traffic from already approved plans for a Marina and for 64 houses at The Tannery.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6646  
Respondent: 10733825 / Karen Thornton  
Agent:

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

I object to the 45 houses at Cockburn Nursery; Tannery Lane is pretty dangerous to drive down as it is. its very narrow in parts and with sharp bends. The Junction onto Send main road is extremely hazardous as cars try to get onto the main road. This will be even worse when it's already dangerous.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1843  
Respondent: 10733921 / Pamela Maynard  
Agent:

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

I object to Policy A42 due to the increase from 45 to 60 homes which equates to a third more in density and is ignoring previous objections by local people to the original plan for Clockbarn Nursery. It will increase already difficult traffic problems at the junction of Tannery Lane and the A247. It will affect what is at the moment nice open countryside and spoil another part of the Green Belt area. Added to this is the risk of surface water flooding which is already experienced across the Broadmeads. Surely it is not wise to increase this threat.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6130  
Respondent: 10734113 / A.H. Finn  
Agent:

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

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because there is very poor access to the main road. Also Tannery Lane is far too narrow. Planning permission has already been given for a Marina and 64 Apartments at the Tannery

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3441</th>
<th>Respondent: 10736545 / Patricia Midson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to houses on Clockbarn nurseries Send Rd is already a nightmare for the traffic that uses it already.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2871</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741729 / Jean Page</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42</td>
<td>I object to policy A 42 because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems that no notice has been taken of the original objections and to the reasons not to build 45 homes and this has now increased to 60 new homes. The problem remains and will be increased that it will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction and will increase pollution. It will have a “knock on” effect on the whole area in terms of traffic congestion and pollution. It impinges on the Green Belt which I am led to believe, both Guildford BC and the current government have given a commitment to protect. It will impact on open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation and will exacerbate the existing problem of surface water flooding. There is no indication that any of the proposed houses will be affordable to local people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/509</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1563</th>
<th>Respondent: 10742753 / Debbie Leane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockburn nursery. Such an action would be incredibly irresponsible of the local council. Traffic along Send Road is extremely high and consequently it is hazardous for cars trying to join it from Tannery Lane. The future additional housing at Tannery and the new marina development will only increase traffic on this road and therefore exacerbate the danger.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1591  **Respondent:** 10742753 / Debbie Leane  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane. How can the council justify a 33% increase to 60 homes from 40, again ignoring the objections of the local people and placing the entire burden on Send village? This will only further exacerbate the traffic problems and dangers we already face around Tannery lane and the junction of the A247. Also and even more importantly, such development of housing would spoil the outstanding views from the River Wey.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2541  **Respondent:** 10743105 / Nicola Jones  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42 in respect of the increase in the number of proposed housing at Clockbarn Nursery by a third. The development is on a narrow lane unsuitable for larger volumes of traffic and will worsen the busy and uncontrolled junction with the A247, particularly with the impact with the ill thought out plan to enlarge the junction on the A3 at Burnt Common with the inevitable and unacceptable increase in the volume of traffic using the village as a through route to and from Woking - it will be impossible to turn right out of Tannery Lane at busy times. Policy A42 also ignores the large volume of objections previously made to the development of this site and is an affront to local democracy which is supposed to seriously consider local opinion, not dismiss it out of hand and worsen the situation.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3494  **Respondent:** 10749409 / B. Holmes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
I object to the proposed developments on scale and infrastructure basis.

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 Sect 4 paras 34,35,36,37. Send is already congested during rush hours and school times with long queues forming along the A247 on a regular basis. Any junction improvements with Tannery Lane will exacerbate the situation as increased traffic will back up along the A247 in busy periods. Yellow lines along the route would cause difficulties for access to the shops and schools and force parking into residential roads. Tannery Lane is single track for most of its length and is wholly unsuitable for any increased traffic flow from the proposed new developments. It would also be dangerous for walkers and cyclists. Not only would this adversely impact Send village but also at the other end into Ripley via Papercourt Lane or Polesden Lane (both single width) onto Newark Lane. Access into Ripley onto the B2215 at this point is single width and any increased traffic flow would be unacceptable by any reasonable standard. The A3 at Ripley is often queued northbound due to frequent congestion at M25 Wisley J10 towards Heathrow.

Transport links are poor. Buses to Woking and Guildford are approximately every hour and hardly convenient in rush hour. Getting to Clandon station is more difficult and time inefficient. Whether Send Villages Medical Centre could cope with additional population is questionable as it is often difficult to get a prompt appointment now e.g. 10 days recently.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2950  Respondent: 10749409 / B. Holmes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery lane, Send
Allocation - 60 Homes (increased from 45).

I object to this policy and comment on the amendments only in this instance as requested (my previous comments from the 2016 consultation still apply).

There were many objections to the original proposal and the proposed increase in homes appears to ignore those and just magnifies the problem.

More erosion of the Send Green Belt.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3256  Respondent: 10750945 / Lorna Crispin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT to Policy A42 building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Tannery lane is a narrow country lane and not suitable to take any more traffic. The junction with Send road will become significantly more hazardous it will also create rat runs around the network of country lanes around Papercourt and
Ripley will become more of a cut through and dangerous. Development of this area would destroy Green Space habitat and destroy the buffer between Send Village and the Tannery Lane business area.

This site must not be developed.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2814  **Respondent:** 10756961 / Carol Marsh  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

**Site A42 in Tannery Lane**

- The increase in housing from 45 to 60 at site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network within and around Ripley.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7053  **Respondent:** 10757185 / Liz George  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

45 houses at Clockburn Nursery

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/460  **Respondent:** 10764385 / E.E Whearley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to the Policy A42 change in Tannery Lane because:

1. No proof of need of sudden increase from 45 to 60 houses.
2. Flooding problems not considered.
3. Traffic situation through Send and Ripley already a major issue.
4. Infrastructure will be unable to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
**Comment ID:** pslp172/1157  **Respondent:** 10773025 / Graham Wright  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

A42 Clockbarn Nursery additional 15 houses added.

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

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3309  **Respondent:** 10773409 / Anne Monk  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Firstly, I object to Policy A42 for the change at Clockburn Nursery. The reasons for this statement include: It will create a third more than the previous amount of homes here. This is an unacceptable increase. Tannery Lane is narrow and not designed for lots of cars and this increase in homes will cause a lot of traffic issues. It will become more dangerous for people trying to be fit and healthy, lots of people walk and cycle along here and as a nation trying to encourage exercise and fitness in an age of obesity and health related problems this should be considered not only here but in the rest of the surrounding area where roads are already congested and cycling hazardous. Building into the Greenbelt will impact the local countryside—something that distinguishes this area from that of areas nearer to London and in effect our area will become part of outer London.

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

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3168  **Respondent:** 10773825 / Pierre Foskett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I also object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn Nurseries in Tannery Lane because of the increase in traffic this will cause and the safety of the road junctions in the village. There will be further strain in amenities such as schools, medical centres etc which are currently straining under the pressures of recent housing developments.

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

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1626  **Respondent:** 10774817 / Jack Aboe  **Agent:**
I object to the increase of housing on this site primarily due to the poor road access to the site and the likely increase of traffic through Send.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1727   Respondent: 10774881 / Kate Cheyne   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

(1) I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

The latest draft plan proposes 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more than previously proposed. This shows a completed disregard for the previous comments and objections of the community.

Now more homes than previously proposed means all impacts previously stated will be greater, including:

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. Future access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
3. Erosion of the Green Belt in our village

1. Surface water flooding, which is already a problem, will become even worse
2. It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2410   Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

This policy INCREASES previous proposals by a third from 45 to 60 homes. This is far too many. Tannery Lane is very narrow and the junction with Send Road is busy. this proposal will only make that worse.

Thousands of people use the Wey Navigation and its towpath recreationally every year. They do so to enjoy the countryside and views along the canal. This proposal will seriously affect the canal between the Broadmead Bridge and Tannery bridge, already built up on too much on the Send bank.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbam because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. It is a country LANE. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42
I object most strongly to the changes made to Policy A42
These are my reasons:
I note that the changes you have made actually increase the number of homes from 45 to 60 - a 33% rise which is too much. This ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people - I cannot understand why you have done this. The access and traffic problems that already exist in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction will worsen that is for sure. Erosion of the Green Belt in our village will become worse along with the surface water flooding, which is already a serious problem. The countryside views from the River Wey Navigation that are enjoyed by so many will be spoiled.

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

Development of this part of Send will result in even more traffic on the heavily congested A247. Furthermore, Tannery Lane is a country lane that was never designed to cope with the levels of traffic that 60 additional houses would bring. I objected when it was 45 (along with hundreds of other objectors). How upscaling this by a third, without improvement to the infrastructure (and flash flooding situation during heavy rain) could even be considered is truly alarming.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/2938  Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I therefore strongly object to the following:
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42
Now 60 homes in place of 45 previously.

The increase of 45 houses to 60 is 33% more and too much.
It will worsen traffic problems at Tannery Lane (Please note this is a LANE) and at the already dangerous junction of A247.
It will erode the green belt of the village even more.
It will worsen surface water flooding which is already bad.
It will impact on the countryside views from the River Wey Navigation which is enjoyed by many people visiting the county as well as locals.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1570  Respondent: 10786113 / John Creasey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I OBJECT TO POLICY A42 because you have increased the number of house from 45 to 60, an increase of 33%. There A lot of objections to the original number were raised so why increase it? I feel this increase is unacceptable and will lead to a considerable increase in traffic on an already extremely busy road.

The Government policy was to protect the green belt which you seem to ignore. The land around Send already floods in winter so where will the water go when it is concreted over? Probably to flood the existing houses.

Send is an ancient village mentioned in the Domesday Book so building on the greenbelt will destroy the nature of the village.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/765  Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Clockbam Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The large number of previous objections made by the local people has been ignored.
- The increase from 45 homes to 60 homes is too high.
- It will make worse the traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
- There is already surface water flooding and this will make it worse.
- The open countryside views from the River Way will be ruined.
- The Green Belt in our area has already been eroded and this will worsen the situation.

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

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to building 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is a quiet single lane country road and is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The traffic volume has increased dramatically since the Business Park has grown and it is very dangerous. I have seen six cars backing up each way to get around a bend on many occasions. The junction to Send Road is also extremely hazardous for vehicles trying to access the main road. Planning permission has been granted for 64 homes on the Tannery Site and a new Marina both of which will generate heaving traffic.

There are also bats on the site which are a protected species. We also see Lapwings and Cuckoos every Spring and early Summer. All these endangered species will disappear. Every winter we get flooding in our garden, so badly that we have to pump out the water to stop incursion into the house. Building on this area will increase this risk.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2631  Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane, Send, because:

a) There is an increase of 33% in the number of homes from 45 to 60. This is far too many for this rural area.

b) The traffic along Tannery Lane and at the junction to the A247 (Send Road) is already very busy during rush hour. The increase in houses and therefore traffic will make it intolerable.

c) Severe water surface flooding will be made even worse.

d) It will have a greater impact on the countryside views from the River Wey.

e) Hundreds of previous objections from local people seem to have been ignored

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7936  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

We object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all
times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable. The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/942  **Respondent:** 10799489 / Shai Sinai  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

As residents of Burnt Common our area has been threatened with irreversible and excessive development on all sides completely destroying what is left of our rural landscape.

I object to policy A42 change at clock barn in Tannery Lane because;

there has been a 33% increase in planned new homes from 45 to 60 ignoring hundreds of previous objections and adding to traffic congestion at the a247 junction. Contributing to increased surfaced water flooding which already exists. It will impact on the countryside surrounding the river wey navigation and it is greenbelt land which should not be built on.

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

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1642  **Respondent:** 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

**Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42**

*Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously*

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1270  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Guildford Borough Submission Local Plan 2016. 
I object to Policy A42 - the building of houses in Tannery Lane. 

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1718  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because: 

• The change represents an increase of 33% in homes and this is excessive for the area 
• It ignores the hundreds of objections made by locals previously 
• Further increase in housing development will negatively impact the traffic problems in the area. Traffic on the A247 junction is already an issue. 
• Further increase in housing development will negatively impact the Green belt 
• Further increase in housing development will negatively change the character of our village to worse 
• Further increase in housing development will impact the views from the River Wey Navigation 
• Further increase in housing development will impact the local school. More places will be required in a school that has little capacity. 
• Further increase in housing development will impact negatively on local population health. The Villages Medical Centre is already maximised and can’t deal with more demand. 

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1927  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% greater than previous Plan, which itself was too
It will seriously worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction, which is
currently bad at peak times. This is likely to push more traffic down the narrow lanes and towards Papercourt Lane
It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse – something that all climate change forecasts suggest will become a major issue if removal of flood plain and run-off areas are removed
It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

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

Attached documents:
Starting with A42 Tannery Lane

I object to the proposal to increase dwellings from 45 to 60.

You gave permission for the marina and we presumed this would mean an amount of extra buildings but NOT 60. The narrow roads from Send Road or Polesden Lane to access the proposed building land are completely unsuitable - services are stretched to bursting point and traffic which is at present extremely heavy will become impossible.

More objections are covered by A43.

All the above building is planned on the GREEN BELT which goes against all the previous promises to keep England Green.

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

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A42 and the increase in the number of homes at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane. The increase to 60 homes will only increase access and traffic problems - Tannery Lane was entirely unsuitable to having 45 new homes, now you propose 60. The number of cars and increase in traffic is unsupportable on this lane - recent guidelines reducing the pollution to young people and the elderly due to idling engines will impact on vulnerable people living locally as well as to the schools in our area. Not only that, flooding is likely to increase, as well as the reduction of green belt. It seems you are determined to link up villages in the area, completely wiping out green belt. On this basis, I also object to Policy 2 (4.3.15), which removes Send Business Park out of the green belt. As a dog walker and nature lover - you are destroying recreational space and damaging what little wildlife we have left in the area. In addition I object to Policy A43, which now has 400 homes recommended for this site - This is permanent, historic green belt and covered by the no exceptional circumstances clause - the number of homes is huge and again, will impact heavily on the traffic in the area - traffic that is already a problem - creating a new access road onto the A3 will just add to the congestion in both directions.

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

I just wanted to write and register my objection to the latest draft of the local plan and its impact on Send village. As one of the previous objectors, I know that you had over 30,000 objections to the last iteration of this plan - yet the new amendments have done nothing to improve, or take into account the numerous problems that it will generate for the local area. It appears that Guildford Borough Council (GBC) has not taken into account any of the objections made during the last round of consultation - this appears GBC are just paying lip-service to public consultation.

Attached documents:
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3117  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3169  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/238  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

I object to the fact that the proposed number of homes has been increased from 45 to 60 which is incredible you having had so many previous objections to this site. Tannery lane is a very narrow lane with poor,dangerous, access at either end and quite unsuitable for a large development. The site is on Green Belt Land which is subject to flooding and will the development will impact on the River Wey Navigation. There are already sewage problems in this area as the local plant is unable to cope with excess rain water.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1636   Respondent: 10816481 / Jeff Waine   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

It seems you GBC have a complete disregard for us local residents of Send & Ripley, we rise thousands of objections to building on the Green Belt surrounding our village and you go ahead and change your local plan, so we all have to object again, but this time you increase your greed for land and housing. Therefore i object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery lane because it is a third more home then the original proposal, Tannery lane itself is very narrow and very prone to flooding, beside the gridlock and pollution you will be causing on the already congested roads, and also impacting on the open countryside to impacts of pollution and building.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1656   Respondent: 10816481 / Jeff Waine   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Therefore i object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery lane because it is a third more home then the original proposal, Tannery lane itself is very narrow and very prone to flooding, beside the gridlock and pollution you will be causing on the already congested roads, and also impacting on the open countryside to impacts of pollution and building.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/135   Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Therefore i object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery lane because it is a third more home then the original proposal, Tannery lane itself is very narrow and very prone to flooding, beside the gridlock and pollution you will be causing on the already congested roads, and also impacting on the open countryside to impacts of pollution and building.
8. The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. There are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network. Every day there are jams and problems on the local roads and this is only going to intensify with more and heavier traffic. More houses means yet more pressure on already stretched local services.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3412  Respondent: 10817601 / Gerald Watson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above policy because of the increase in the number of houses intended for this site. Rather than listen to the hundreds of objections put to you last year that the number was too many, you have chosen to increase the number to 60. This shows you are really not listening. Increased traffic at the crossroads with the A247, particularly at busy times when children are walking alone or being walked to and from the local schools will make for a dangerous situation. Parking is already busy round that junction and additional traffic will create a gratuitous situation for accidents.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2705  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to the very poor vehicular access.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7561  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to the very poor vehicular access.

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

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to POLICY A42, CLOCKBARN TANNERY LANE: because it will illegally erode the Green Belt in Send Village, cause more flooding due to the greater number of houses proposed and worsen traffic problems and pollution.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DRAFT LOCAL PLAN SITES A42, A43, A44- PLEASE PASS LETTER TO INSPECTOR

I object as a Send resident to the above proposals.

1. The number of new house builds being proposed in Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. 485 is excessive and not necessary. 485 houses could mean 1940 people and 970 cars. The infrastructure will not be able to cope. There are already new houses to be built on the Vision Engineering site.

2 I object to the 7000 sq m of warehousing being included in A43. Burnt Common already has warehouse facilities further down the road not near housing.

3 I object to the amount of extra traffic and pollution these proposals will bring to an already Busy area. The permission for the Marina is soon to test this further.

4. I object to the proposal of Send being removed from the Green Belt. Our Green Belt is an area separating us from Guildford and Woking, plus a safe haven for wildlife. There are many ancient trees around this area, especially in the A43 proposal.

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

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have been forced to compose this email as I feel once again I have been let down by Guildford Borough Council. Considering residents of Send, Send Marsh & Burnt Common raised over 30% of objections received to the draft local plan of 2016 we still appear to have been singled out unfairly by Guildford Borough Council.

I object to Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane Send increase in houses application from 45 to 60.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1869  Respondent: 10819425 / MP Parrott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane because:
The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 in the original application is too much and will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction.
This development will further erode the Green Belt in our village.
The change ignores all the hundreds of previous objections.
This development will make worse the surface water flooding in this area.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2132  Respondent: 10820417 / Trevor Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• The increase in number of homes by over 30% more from 45 to 60 is excessive
• This change has ignored hundreds of previous objections made by local residents
• This will worsen traffic problems and access in and to Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• This will definitely made the erosion of the green belt in our village worse
• Surface water flooding which is really bad will be made worse by this change
• The River Wey Navigation will be impacted by worsening the countryside views

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2133  Respondent: 10820481 / Lisa Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase in number of homes by over 30% more from 45 to 60 is excessive
- This change has ignored hundreds of previous objections made by local residents
- This will worsen traffic problems and access in and to Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- This will definitely make the erosion of the green belt in our village worse
- Surface water flooding which is really bad will be made worse by this change
- The River Wey Navigation will be impacted by worsening the countryside views

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/474  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

Clockbarn Nursery Tanney Lane. Policy A42. I object to the policy because

- To increase to 60 from 45 homes is a third more than before.
- Traffic problems will worsen in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction will worsen.
- It ignores hundreds of previous objections made to previous plan
- It worsens surface water flooding which is already bad
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in the village

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1786  Respondent: 10821665 / Chris Sansom  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

POLICY A42-CLOCKBARN NURSERY, TANNERY LANE

Even ignoring the fact that the Council has proposed an increase of planning permission from 45 to 60 houses on this site, the access and egress from Send Road into/out of Tannery Lane is totally unsuitable (ie very narrow and often obscured visibility) and similarly at the junction into Newark Lane (at the Ripley end of the road). The Lane is basically single track with passing areas along its whole length and there are already existing businesses established at the old Tannery/ Send Business Park site.

This proposed housing development will also cause the following problems:-

An approximation of an additional 100 vehicles thus creating at least 200 movements per day, causing more pollution.

Send Primary School has no further capacity for more pupils, and local secondary schools are in a similar position.
The Villages Medical Centre has no further capacity for more patients.

The current utilities infrastructure already struggles to meet the existing demands of the village (ie low water pressure, power 'outs')-to upgrade the utilities to meet the increased demand will not only cause disruption to the existing customers, it will also further delay traffic.

It is a change of land usage-causing further loss of green belt/agricultural into domestic occupation, which will not only affect the view from the Wey Navigation but also, can it be guaranteed that any development here will not cause pollution to the waterway? Or cause further surface flooding?

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2015  Respondent: 10824961 / Debby Fieldus  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object to further development at Clockbarn Nursery – Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction onto the Send road is already dangerous and will be made much worse if this development is allowed.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2992  Respondent: 10826145 / Terry Fieldus  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to further development at Tannery Lane – this road is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffice and the junction with Send road is already very hazardous.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5987  Respondent: 10826209 / David Rider  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn as the existing roads (Tannery Lane) are very narrow and struggle to cope with current traffic levels. Adding further houses would cause major traffic issues all day long that would also impact Send and Send Marsh areas. In addition, permission has already been granted for a marina development that current infrastructure will not be able to cope – a second development is just nonsensical.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2804  Respondent: 10826209 / David Rider  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the expanded size of this plot from 45 to 60 homes in an area with very narrow existing roads. Currently, there are significant traffic jams in the immediate areas during morning and evening, and adding 60 homes will cause considerably more congestion on roads that are not designed for such levels of use. Furthermore, the views and sense of local countryside in this area will be lost with this increase in new housing. Existing Send school and medical facilities will not be able to cope with a further 60 families needs and hence new residents will have to travel further to schools and medical facilities outside the area causing further traffic congestion.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/129  Respondent: 10826497 / Barry Vince  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As for the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley, where we live.

Please think again and do not spoil our Greenbelt.

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

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3159  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42). This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan and will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This proposal appears in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." Despite this statement there are no proposals to improve the local roads, instead, to add more junctions with the A3 thereby...
increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network. A totally inappropriate site and a very worrying proposal for local residents!

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3160  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

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

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

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan".

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this statement in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and therefore should not go ahead.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5930  Respondent: 10828801 / Kathryn Fox  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

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

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

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

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/5409  Respondent: 10828897 / Christopher Merrick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
11. I strongly object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42). This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan and will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This proposal appears in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." Despite this statement there are no proposals to improve the local roads, instead, to add more junctions with the A3 thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network. A totally inappropriate site and a very worrying proposal for local residents!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2409  
Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  
Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

This policy INCREASES previous proposals by a third from 45 to 60 homes. This is far too many. Tannery Lane is very narrow and the junction with Send Road is busy. this proposal will only make that worse.

Thousands of people use the Wey Navigation and its towpath recreationally every year. They do so to enjoy the countryside and views along the canal. This proposal will seriously affect the canal between the Broadmead Bridge and Tannery bridge, already built up on too much on the Send bank.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4421  
Respondent: 10828993 / Naomi Rider  
Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn as the existing roads (Tannery Lane) are very narrow and struggle to cope with current traffic levels. Adding further houses would cause major traffic issues all day long that would also impact Send and Send Marsh areas. In addition, permission has already been granted for a marina development that current infrastructure will not be able to cope – a second development is just nonsensical.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4242  
Respondent: 10828993 / Naomi Rider  
Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Clockbarn Nursery Policy A42

I object to the expanded size of this plot from 45 to 60 homes in an area with very narrow existing roads. Currently, there are significant traffic jams in the immediate areas during morning and evening, and adding 60 homes will cause considerably more congestion on roads that are not designed for such levels of use. Furthermore, the views and sense of local countryside in this area will be lost with this increase in new housing. Existing Send school and medical facilities will not be able to cope with a further 60 families needs and hence new residents will have to travel further to schools and medical facilities outside the area causing further traffic congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1686  Respondent: 10829121 / Julie Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane - increase in homes from 45 - 60

The Village of Send is on Green Belt Land and therefore should only be built on in exceptional circumstances

The number of homes has increased from 45 to 60, which is 33% MORE. This is unacceptable.

The plan has ignored thousands of objections from the local people of Send

The traffic access and congestion around Tannery Lane and the A247 will be made worse

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2352  Respondent: 10830689 / Brian Robinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It appears that little attention has been paid to the previous planning objections as allowing for the fact that we need more houses our part of Guildford has been targeted disproportionate.

I must object to the additional homes suggested for Policy A42 at Clockbarn Nursery from 45 to 60 this will cause gridlock for the centre of Send, together with the additional problems of erosion of the Green Belt and exacerbate flooding problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2932  Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This number of houses is too high because of inadequate access and traffic volume in the narrow lanes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1891</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will considerably worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village even worse;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will impact open countryside views from the National Trust River Wey Navigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2752</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10830785 / PE Whatley</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal A42 to increase the number of homes to be built at Clockbarn Nursery from 45 to 60 because any increase in traffic on this narrow road, which is already dangerous to walk or drive along, is a matter of safety. Any increase in traffic will not improve the situation and I have already objected to 45 houses, so am not likely to find 60 agreeable and neither are all the others who objected to this proposal in the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6485</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 10831681 / James Cope</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take and more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building a marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more traffic. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3162  Respondent: 10831681 / James Cope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3098  Respondent: 10832129 / Christopher Lawrence  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Anyway I do continue to object to Policy A42 change at Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane because:

The increase to 60 from 45 homes.
It ignores, as I said before, the thousands of objections by the people of Send.
It ignores the horrendous traffic problems this development will cause to village roads.
It is an erosion of the Green Belt.
It will make surface water flooding even worse

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7334  Respondent: 10833025 / M Wright  Agent:
I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

Conclusion:

It appears that GBC are desperately and naively clutching at straws to find what they think are suitable sites to include in the Local Plan, instead of carefully identifying already suitable Brownfield sites. GBC need to realise how important the Green Belt is, and stop treating it as a free space to indiscriminately destroy for generations to come.

This Local Plan seems to have been thrown together with no real thought, we need a ‘common sense’ Local Plan, not this rubbish.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

Conclusion:

It appears that GBC are desperately and naively clutching at straws to find what they think are suitable sites to include in the Local Plan, instead of carefully identifying already suitable Brownfield sites. GBC need to realise how important the Green Belt is, and stop treating it as a free space to indiscriminately destroy for generations to come.

This Local Plan seems to have been thrown together with no real thought, we need a ‘common sense’ Local Plan, not this rubbish.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5815  Respondent: 10835617 / Glenis Pycraft  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, on Tannery Lane. There are already 64 houses planned for the area, plus the development of a marina, on a narrow, single track country road which cannot take the traffic. The planned building of these houses is already too much for this site (which also consistently floods) so adding 45 more houses would be disastrous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1001  Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send. It will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3391  Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site proposed under Policy A42. Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments on the adjacent site, any additional development on Tannery lane will create further safety issues with respect to the traffic loads on this narrow road and its junction with Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/883  Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes under Policy A42 of the Plan to increase the number of homes at Clockbarn Nursery to 60. This proposal takes no account of the many objections raised previously regarding the development of this site with respect to traffic along Tannery lane and its junction with Send Road, drainage and erosion of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2375  Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A42 change at Clockbarn on Tannery Lane because; you have ignored the many objections raised previously by local residents by increasing by 33% the housing proposed to 60 versus 45, this will exacerbate traffic volumes in Tannery Lane and its junction with the A247 in the heart of our village, which is already overwhelmed at morning and evening rush hours. views over the open countryside to the river Wey will be spoilt as the Green Belt is further reduced and surface water flooding will be increased.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2503  Respondent: 10839073 / Annie Hutchison  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
I object to the housing development at Clockbarn Nursery. Once again the proposed development would greatly increase the traffic along a narrow road, particularly given that the Marina development will also lead to increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/798  Respondent: 10839233 / Sheila Harris  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes to increase the number of homes at Clockbarn Nursery to 60 under Policy A42 of the Plan. The increase in number is totally unacceptable and takes no account of previous concerns raised regarding the development of this site with respect to traffic management and safety along Tannery Lane and its junction with the A247 at Send Road. A full and thorough TIA must be carried out to prove beyond doubt that the inherent dangers associated with the additional traffic from this development and the Send Business Park can be managed and the appropriate road and junction improvements can and will be implemented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3414  Respondent: 10839649 / Lawrence Harris  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site proposed under Policy A42a. Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments on the adjacent site. Any additional development on Tannery lane will create further safety issues with respect to the traffic loads on this narrow road and its junction with Send Road. A full and thorough TIA must be carried out to prove beyond doubt that the inherent dangers associated with the additional traffic from these developments can be managed and the appropriate road and junction improvements can and will be implemented before any development goes ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the proposed changes to increase the number of homes at Clockbarn Nursery to 60 under Policy A42 of the Plan. The increase in number is totally unacceptable and takes no account of previous concerns raised regarding the development of this site with respect to traffic management and safety along Tannery Lane and its junction with the A247 at Send Road. A full and thorough TIA must be carried out to prove beyond doubt that the inherent dangers associated with the additional traffic from this development and the Send Business Park can be managed and the appropriate road and junction improvements can and will be implemented.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2787  Respondent: 10839937 / Mark Pycraft  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery on Tannery Lane. The lane is winding and narrow, with several blind corners, and is only wide enough for one vehicle at a time in many places. To build here would require a huge remodelling of the area and complete construction of a new road, thus decimating this Green Belt land, which is actually prone to frequent flooding (The area is called Send Marsh for a reason). It also acts as an important buffer between Send Marsh and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1547  Respondent: 10840321 / J.A. Manlow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:-

60 Homes – our schools will be even more overcrowded – what about extra traffic problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3209  Respondent: 10840769 / Rosemarie Haxton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because,
The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is **33% more** and too much for the area and therefore making the current access and traffic problems affecting Tannery Lane and A247 junction during rush hour and school drop off/collection worse.

The current removal of the Green Belt in our village will increase, and there will no longer be views of the River Wey Navigation that we and our children currently enjoy.

Surface water flooding which is already an issue, will worsen.

The previous objections by the local people to this have obviously been ignored.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4149  **Respondent:** 10843521 / Yvonne Woozley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2686  **Respondent:** 10843585 / Jackie Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane, Send as the junction at the top of Tannery Lane is already very narrow and dangerous with limited visibility. Tannery Lane is a country lane and is not designed for such a development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane, Send as the junction at the top of Tannery Lane is already very narrow and dangerous with limited visibility. Tannery Lane is a country lane and is not designed for such a development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/293  Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 as Tannery Lane is a country lane and development at Clockbarn Nursery will make access and traffic problems worse at the A247 junction. This is already a dangerous junction with poor visibility. It will also spoil open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/170  Respondent: 10844673 / James Purkiss  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 because there are too many homes being proposed for the existing infrastructure. The roads are already poorly maintained, narrow and in places dangerous. Increased traffic will be a burden and a hazard. Additionally I absolutely do not want to wantonly erode the green belt. It's there for a reason and it's disgusting you plan on destroying it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3811  Respondent: 10844929 / Maureen Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane due to the following points:

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is single track for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical with 45 homes, so an increase of 33% is just ridiculous.
Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with traffic for 45 extra homes, so an increase is not going to work.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. The traffic for this development has not yet been added to the current traffic situation.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane, so an increase in homes just exacerbates the problem.

This change ignores hundreds of previous objections. These have been made by people who live locally, the people who know the area best, they should be listened to, not pushed to one side.

Surface water flooding will be increased with the original number of homes, additional homes will make the situation worse still.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase in homes will worsen the chronic traffic conditions through Send and associated roads (as per my response to earlier draft Local Plans), and the impact on other services. This will be exacerbated if Policy A43 is also enacted.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/382  **Respondent:** 10846241 / John Ford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because despite the many objections made previously by local people the development has been increased by 33%. Obviously this will make worse the traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

In addition it will increase the Green Belt erosion, surface water flooding and spoil the views on the River Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6771  **Respondent:** 10846625 / Frank Drennan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1.1 **I object** to policy A42 “Clockbarn Nursery” on the grounds that;

1.2 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

1.3 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

1.4 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

1.5 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

1.6 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
1.1 I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes.

1.2 It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.

1.3 The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.

1.4 It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

1.5 It will make erosion of Green Belt in our village worse.

1.6 It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.

1.7 It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

1.8 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

1.9 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most of its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

1.10 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

1.11 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

1.12 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

• The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. There are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network. Every day there are jams and problems on the local roads and this is only going to intensify with more and heavier traffic. More houses means yet more pressure on already stretched local services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6439</th>
<th>Respondent: 10848577 / Jen Dunbar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow and gives inadequate access for the significant traffic volume which this will bring. The junction with Send Road is already dangerous and a dramatic increase in traffic will make it more so. Permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina so traffic is already set to increase, but the area will not be able to cope with the further increase. Pollution and noise will increase, and this will have a negative impact on residents and wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6313</th>
<th>Respondent: 10849697 / Audrey Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery as there is such poor access and such great volume of traffic. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and cannot take more traffic. It is exceptionally dangerous for any vehicles exiting there to the main Send Road. The Lane just cannot take any more traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/375</th>
<th>Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to the building of 45 homes on this site. The traffic in our village is already excessive, Tannery Lane is a small country lane that cannot sustain more traffic and the junction onto Send Road is already dangerous. I am also concerned about flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: pslp172/507   Respondent:  10851745 / Natalie Green   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

You have increased the number of houses and not reduced the number in your plan.

The traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction are already dangerous and will worsen.

It will ruin and make the erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3560   Respondent:  10852289 / Barry Scott   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. This road is far too narrow to take on more traffic with the junction with Send Road being hazardous when trying to pull out into the main road. there is already a development going ahead including 64 apartments and a marina which will increase congestion in this road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3132   Respondent:  10852289 / Barry Scott   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase in the number of proposed homes on the plan has increased by a third, with no reasonable justification
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem, and increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

a) The 33% increase in housing is over excessive.

b) Previous objections by local people have been ignored.

c) Traffic problems between Tannery Lane at the junction with A247 would be worse.

d) Green Belt erosion would worsen.

e) Flood risks would worsen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7911  Respondent: 10856801 / Jennifer Tigwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

The junction with Tannery Lane and the Send Road is permanently busy and potentially dangerous.

It is not an easy junction to get in and out of - at any time of day.

Tannery Lane is nothing more than a country lane. To build additional housing and the proposed Marina, combined with the proposed A3 interchange will undoubtedly have a major and damaging effect on residents and traffic congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6940  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

There is inadequate access and high local traffic volume.

Planning permission has been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina. This will generate additional heavy traffic. By adding another 45 houses, this will greatly add to the traffic already there. It will be even more chaotic. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous for vehicles joining the Main Road, this proposal will make it even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8263  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable. The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3213  Respondent: 10859265 / Neil Haxton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because,

The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more, therefore a significant increase on stretched area and too much for the area and therefore making the current access and traffic problems affecting Tannery Lane and A247 junction during rush hour and school drop off/collection worse.

The current removal of the Green Belt in our village will increase, and there will no longer be views of the River Wey Navigation that we and our children currently enjoy.

Surface water flooding which is already an issue, will potentially worsen.

The previous objections by the local people to this have obviously been ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4486  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nurseries, Tannery Lane
Proposal for 45 houses
I object to this proposal as there is no requirement for these houses

I object also on the grounds that Tannery Lane is narrow and winding and this development in addition 64 homes which already have planning permission and the new Marina will create real problems for motorists as well as endangering cyclists and pedestrians

I object as this development will exacerbate problems at the Send Road/Tannery Lane junction which is already hazardous

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3831  Respondent: 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1 POLICY A42 CLOCKBARN NURSERY

1.1 I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes.

1.2 It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people

1.3 The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.

1.4 It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

1.5 It will make erosion of Green Belt in our village worse

1.6 It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse

1.7 It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

1.8 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

1.9 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most of its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

1.10 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

1.11 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

1.12 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/676  Respondent: 10859585 / Irene Grainger  Agent:
I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

The increase to 60 homes is totally unacceptable, especially as I felt 45 was too many

It ignores all the previous objections raised by the local people

It will seriously worsen access and already unacceptable traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse

It will make surface water flooding a much more serious threat than it already is

It will impact countryside views from the River Way Navigation and will greatly affect the wildlife

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Therefore I strongly object Policy A42

The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.

It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.

It ignores the hundreds of objections made by our village.

It will cause traffic problems in Tannery Lane at the junction of Tannery Lane and A247.

It will make surface water flooding, which is already a problem, even worse.

It will interrupt the open countryside views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Inadequate access and insufficient consideration of traffic volume.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2401</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861217 / Lesley Mantell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

policy A42. My home overlooks the proposed site in Tannery lane and I object strongly to 60 new homes up from 45. The infrastructure (sewage, schools, doctors) will not take the additional homes, this is absolute madness and you have totally disregarded any comments I have made.

We already flood in some parts of the village and additional building will make it worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2448</th>
<th>Respondent: 10861217 / Lesley Mantell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A42

Because the original plan of 45 homes in itself is far too many but to now increase to 60 is far beyond the village and the road and traffic problems it will create to even contemplate.

I fear for the safety of the local children and the hundreds more that will be joining them. The area can be prone to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2196</th>
<th>Respondent: 10865889 / Dreda M Todd DBO</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the potential traffic volume in a narrow twisty lane which is already subject to planning permission for 64 apartments at the Tannery and a Marina. The junction with the A247 is already dangerous and the lane cannot take more traffic.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2530  Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 because

1/The current plans will be an over development of our village, already increased from 45 to 60 homes from the last plan.
2/You are ignoring thousands of previous objections
3/Will cause surface water flooding
4/Will create excessive traffic through the already busy village
5/Takes away the current greenbelt and open countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1896  Respondent: 10866945 / Kristine Good  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, as the Tannery Lane is too narrow and twisty making it hazardous for increased flow of traffic and the junction with Send Road is difficult to negotiate, especially at busy times forcing errors to be made and accidents occurring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6415  Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, as the Tannery Lane is too narrow and twisty making it hazardous for increased flow of traffic and the junction with Send Road is difficult to negotiate, especially at busy times forcing errors to be made and accidents occurring.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6282  Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2183  Respondent: 10867105 / Steve Loosley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6476  Respondent: 10867137 / Richard Moore  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery. There is inadequate access and Tannery lane is too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction at Tannery lane onto Send Rd is already dangerous and this will make it much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6472</th>
<th>Respondent: 10867329 / Anna Moore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and is not able to sustain the level of traffic that this would create. This lane is already very dangerous and will be made much worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5769</th>
<th>Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I object to site A42a Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane being used for 45 houses as there are real flooding concerns
- I object to site A42a Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane being used for 45 houses as this is a narrow, twisting country lane with inadequate access and Tannery Lane could not cope with the increase of traffic. It junction with Send Road is already a hazard for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has, unfortunately, already been granted for a marina complex along Tannery Lane which will exacerbate the traffic problem at this dangerous junction and along a narrow, twisting country lane

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1881</th>
<th>Respondent: 10869025 / E.J. Bartlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to **Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42** because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much especially given all the previous objections
- It will worsen traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- The Breen belt should be protected with NO exceptions
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: pslp172/609  Respondent: 10869345 / Richard Vickery  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I feel it most necessary to write to you again to object to the various proposed increases in the new draft Local Plan 2017 for Send Ward.

Policy A42 Tannery Lane:

I object to the increase of 33% in homes for this area of Send as it will put an excessive burden on the road access onto Send Road (the main road through Send) which is already overloaded at present, especially from Burnt Common to Old Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8246  Respondent: 10869729 / Ralph Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposals A42, A43 and A44 for a total of 485 homes and 2 travellers pitches in Send on the following grounds:

1. The increased housing will bring with it at least 1-2 cars per household which will add further traffic to the small village roads particularly at peak times. These roads already struggle to cope with current traffic levels.
2. Like much of Surrey the roads around Send are in a poor state and the increased traffic in the area will only add to their deterioration.
3. The increase in population of Send will impact on services such as the Villages Medical Centre where it is already difficult to arrange appointments with the Doctors.
4. There is no need whatsoever for industrial developments in Send as raised in A43. Send is not and never will be the right location for industrial premises being a rural village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1943  Respondent: 10869921 / Kate Haskins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow, with poor access, and the junction with the A247 is already a bottleneck. Another 45 residences will create chaos and is simply inappropriate. The apartments proposed for further down this pretty lane, used by walkers, children on bikes and other cyclists, simply cannot be adequately accessed via the one track lane. Widening this lane will destroy footpaths and farmland. More concrete, less nature. I am pretty sure that’s not what anyone voted for.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/446  Respondent: 10869921 / Kate Haskins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42)
- The number of homes has been increased by 33% on the previous plan, ignoring all concerns raised about traffic and safety issues with the congested A247 junction
- Erosion of the green belt, along with associated declines in quality of life for current residents and visitors to the Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3544  Respondent: 10869985 / Alan Blackburn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

Burnt Common / Garlick's Arch
I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the A247 would be gridlocked all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3341  Respondent: 10869985 / Alan Blackburn  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The increase in the number of houses which were too many to start with. Furthermore you totally ignore all the previous objections. Access will be almost impossible. Remember that Cameron “Would protect the Green Belt as I would my own family”!!

Where on earth is democracy in this county?

Flooding will be worse and it will effect the superb views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3545  Respondent: 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

Burnt Common / Garlick's Arch

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.

I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space.
from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a
40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered
in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3564  Respondent: 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

However I object to Policy A42

The increase in the number of houses which were too many to start with. Furthermore you totally ignore all the previous
objections. Access will be almost impossible. Remember that Cameron “ Would protect the Green Belt as I would my
own family”!!

Where on earth is democracy in this county?

Flooding wil be worse and it will effect the superb views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7562  Respondent: 10872353 / Robin Williams  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries. Our access on to Send Road is from Sandy Lane,
   opposite Tannery Lane: this is a difficult and dangerous junction at the best of times; and things will be made
   worse by this additional building

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7475  Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )
I object to the proposed houses at Clock barn nurseries site. Tannery lane is tiny, already congested and a nightmare to turn out of. The local infrastructure is already over burdened. This makes no sense and needs to be stopped.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3886</th>
<th>Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this proposal as anyone who lives in send who uses Tannery Lane knows the small rural lane is utterly unsuitable for further developments to take place, turning into Send Road from Tannery takes an age and is difficult to exit to Send Road. You have already allowed, despite objections which I assume were again just ignored, a marina no one wanted and which we all knew was a precursor to further development requests. Not only have we been ignored but you have this time decided to INCREASE the number of houses for the site by 30 odd%. The impact on traffic, the green belt, amenities and the area itself makes this a completely unacceptable development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1849</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876833 / J. C. ROBSON</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object in the strongest possible way to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The change represents an increase of 33% in homes and this is excessive for the area
- It ignores the hundreds of objections made by locals previously
- Further increase in housing development will impact the traffic problems in the area. Traffic on the A247 junction is already an issue.
- Further increase in housing development will impact the Green belt.
- Further increase in housing development will change the character of our village for the worse.
- Further increase in housing development will impact the views from the River Wey Navigation.
- Further increase in housing development will impact the local school. More places will be required in a school that has little capacity.
- Further increase in housing development will impact local health care. The Villages Medical Centre is already maximised and can’t deal with more demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4772 | Respondent: 10876993 / Michael Hurdle | Agent: |
I object – traffic will join narrow road, single vehicle width at one point, and then add to traffic with cars parked on roadside at junction with A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3085   Respondent: 10878433 / John Townsend   Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockburn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3026   Respondent: 10879457 / Louisa Scott   Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockburn nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. This road is far too narrow to take on more traffic with the junction with Send Road being hazardous when trying to pull out into the main road. There is already a development going ahead including 64 apartments and a marina which will increase congestion in this road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6541   Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson   Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Anyone with an ounce of sense would realise that Tannery lane is a narrow bendy road joining Send Road at a dangerous junction with two schools within a 500 meter radius. The traffic in Send, at peak hours, is heavily congested and additional traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make matters worse. The congestion is the result of bottlenecks
at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The traffic in Send has already been exacerbated by the recent planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane. A ridiculous idea!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/6607  | Respondent: 10880481 / James Anderson  | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane which will impact future traffic so to consider further development cannot be justified. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/7430  | Respondent: 10880609 / S. Groves  | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and increased traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and winding, with limited passing places and visibility, to take any further traffic loads. The junction with Send Road is already over-crowded and hazardous both when turning in to Tannery Lane, or exiting on to Send Road. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will already create additional burdens on the tiny lane and its traffic load and further development will only exacerbate this situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/6352  | Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

The reason I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn is because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and winding to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for
vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3053  Respondent: 10881217 / Ben Stevens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane. The plan to build sixty homes instead of the 45 originally suggested is ridiculous. This is a 33% increase instead of a reduction of 33% which would suit that particular site. Sixty houses are far too many. It would ensure that current traffic problems in Tannery Lane are worsened and also a large building development there will add extra surface water will add to the flooding issue which exist on that site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/788  Respondent: 10882785 / Stephen Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3467  Respondent: 10885633 / Catherine Jackson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and increased traffic volume this would create. Tannery Lane is a narrow lane that couldn’t sustain more traffic. Plus the junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to turn onto the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It shows an increase of 15 houses on the original, already agreed, 45.
- The Local Plan (H1) has shown a DECREASE in demand for houses by 39 houses per annum from 2018 - 234. Despite this Send's allocation has been increased arbitrarily.
- It will worsen already difficult traffic issues in Tannery Lane itself and at the junction with the A247.
- It will erode the GREEN BELT in out village even more.

ABIDE BY THE ORIGINAL, AGREED POLICY IN ORDER TO BE LEGALLY COMPLIANT WITH REGARD TO ALL THE LOCAL SUBMISSIONS AND OBJECTIONS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED Policy A42 Pages 241-2 is neither sound nor does it comply with the Duty to Co-operate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2821  Respondent: 10896833 / Margaret Morgan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2509  Respondent: 10897633 / A Aldridge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane - Policy A42 I object to Policy A42 change which increases the number of homes to 60 from 45 for the following reasons;-

Traffic problems at the junction with the A247 (Send Road) will be made even more difficult.

Tannery Lane is a narrow country road with poor visibility and in many places is single track with few passing places.

Any increase in population in Send will cause additional strain on services, especially medical.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3818  Respondent: 10897665 / Sue French  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 Clock Barn Nursery, Tannery Lane where 45 houses are proposed. Permission has already been granted for 63 apartments at the Tannery site and the 45 proposed at Clock Barn would bring so much additional traffic on Tannery Lane which, as a narrow and winding lane with restricted width in many places, is simply not fit for this increased burden. The junction with Send Road and Tannery Lane is already dangerous enough without extra traffic. This is agricultural land and is also the habitat of bats and flooding is also a concern. It should not be included in the Local Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2851  **Respondent:** 10898113 / V A Lewis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because -
The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 is 33% more
It ignores all the previous objections made by local people
It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5997  **Respondent:** 10898145 / Louise French  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy 42a Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane - 45 houses. Tannery Lane is a country lane with no pavements and is very twisting with many blind corners and restricted widths with no room for passing cars let alone the many bigger lorries and vans which serve the Tannery industrial site. 63 new apartments have already been granted planning permission at the Tannery, and together with the 45 houses at Clockbarn would generate a huge increase of traffic in the lane, which is also liable to flooding. The junction at Send Road is already dangerous with difficult sight lines.

Clockbarn is agricultural land which is now overgrown but is a habitat for deer, foxes, rabbits, bats and many birds. We do not want to see this wildlife disappear from our countryside.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2520  **Respondent:** 10898721 / J Hawkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It will cause worse flooding in the Tannery Lane area.

If the Marina is built there it will exacerbate traffic in an area of narrow, poorly surfaced lanes.

It will be eroding the Green Belt and will impact on the Wey Navigation.
The original plan for 45 homes was excessive and to increase it by a third is ludicrous. The increase in population will strain existing resources and infrastructure.

The increase in traffic will worsen an already heavily used road system in both directions, towards Send, Ripley and Clandon and also towards Old Woking a busy junction already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7395  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries. This is totally inappropriate use of this land. There is inadequate access, Tannery Lane is a small country lane and should remain as such. This area can already be hazardous, especially for vehicles trying to join Send Road, and this volume of traffic is already destined to increase the building of 64 apartments at The Tannery and the Marina on the canal. This lane will not be able to take any more traffic and should not be increased in size to accommodate any extra vehicles.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3510  Respondent: 10899137 / Justina Buswell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane where there has been an increase from 45 homes to 60. This change takes no account of hundreds of previous objections made by local residents. The increase in numbers of homes will have a seriously detrimental effect on the traffic in the area, particularly as Tannery Lane is a small country road and should remain as such. This development is a significant erosion of the Green Belt in our area and is totally out of keeping with the rural nature and views across the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1349  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery as Tannery Lane is very narrow and cannot take any more traffic.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6599  Respondent: 10902401 / Nick Enderby  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object the building of 45 houses opposite my property at Clockbarn Nurseries for the same reasons that I have argued against development on that plot previously: Tannery Lane is too narrow to withstand extra traffic; the junction between Tannery Lane and Send a Road is already very hazardous and with the planned marina and additional buildings the road is already at capacity. Scant regard has been given to previous objections and, quite frankly, enough is enough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4228  Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A42-Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.

As a regular walker along this lane I wish to point out how dangerous the junction onto the A247 is. There is limited vision when turning either right or left due to resident's parked cars along Send Road. Tannery Lane itself is narrow and at times there is only room for one vehicle at a time at the junction to Send Road due to residents cars parked outside their houses. The lane itself becomes a single track lane and is far too narrow for it to take any more traffic along it. There is already planning permission granted for 64 apartments at The Tannery and for building a Marina. With the added addition of the proposed 45 houses this stretch of road would become very hazardous and dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3565  Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In the original draft plan 45 homes were on the plan now it has increased to 60! The road junction with Tannery Lane and the A247 is very narrow the visibility for turning out of this junction is restricted by parked vehicles along the main road and the lane itself by residents and shoppers.

Tannery Lane itself by its name is only passable as a single-track lane with passing places; it will not be able to sustain the increased traffic arising from the extra homes suggested. I regularly walk this route and have seen first hand the
problems of vehicles trying to turn out of the lane onto the main road. It would seem you have completely ignored the views of all the local objectors in this matter.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1149  Respondent: 10904833 / Elaine Roberts-Toomey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn nursery tannery lane because the increase to 60 homes as even 45 homes would bring far too much traffic to a road that is nearly impossible to exit on to the main road. Assuming 2 cars per home, this would bring 120 cars which would bring grid lock to central Send.

This increase completely ignores all previous objections.

The locality is already subject to local flooding - which will be made worse, which the developers will get away with, the local council will ignore and the local residents have to put up with yet again.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1693  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow, winding and already suffers heavy vehicle movements for the industrial units. The proposed 45 houses, together with the 65 houses already approved, will create a traffic nightmare at the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4268  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn, Send.
I object to this because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more vehicle movements.

I wish these objections to be fully and individually taken into consideration. Please acknowledge receipt and confirm that they will be placed before the Planning Inspectorate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5417  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2446  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6687  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT

For the same reasons I object to Site Allocations A43 & 44; the A247 cannot cope with any more traffic and the village of Send (and surrounding areas) does not have the infrastructure to cope. Send has one GP surgery that is already oversubscribed and one has to wait a good number of weeks for an appointment (if one is lucky). There are “two” bus services, the 462 and the 463 which alternate to run once an hour and the first bus does not get people to Woking in time (fast train connection) to get to London (where many people work) for a work start time before 09h00 – the very first bus of the day only gets to Woking at 08h05 – which means most people will rely on their cars to get to work and their children to school, especially as there is no secondary school within walking distance.

In addition traffic coming from Tannery Lane trying to merge onto Send Road already struggles due to cars parking on the kerbs / alongside the kerbs. It’s very poor visibility and it will be a major safety risk having even more cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I would like to raise the following objections to the plans proposed to impose a change of use on the Clockbarn nursery site (A42) and to develop and build 45 residential dwellings.

- The current Clockbarn site is presently agricultural land within the Greenbelt and should have such status preserved.
- Tannery Lane does not have the width to accommodate the recent increased traffic, particularly as a result of the development of the Tannery light industrial estate which generates at least 100 cars and tens of commercial vehicles passing along it each working day. An additional increase in vehicles resulting from this proposed residential development would create a traffic congestion situation that the lane simply could not accommodate.

- Present traffic turning right into Tannery Lane from Send Road (A247) often creates a queue backing up Send Road as a result of the volume of traffic passing along the A247, being a main artery between the A3 and Woking. This creates delays for what is already a busy route for many, especially in peak traffic times.
- Present traffic turning out of Tannery Lane onto the Send Road (A247) frequently backs up down Tannery Lane as the volume of traffic passing along the A247 means vehicles must wait a considerable time for an appropriate gap in the traffic to turn out of Tannery Lane.
- An increase in the volume of vehicles passing in and out of Tannery Lane would exacerbate this existing problem.
• The width of Tannery Lane heading towards Newark Lane is, in some places, only a car's width wide and has several blind corners. Additional traffic simply cannot be accommodated along this stretch of the lane. It would be impractical to look to widen this stretch as it is primarily bordered by residential front gardens and Papercourt Marsh.

• Tannery Lane is a route to which many walkers, joggers, dog walkers, cyclists and hikers take to get to the River Wey with its towpaths and footpaths. An increase in traffic, which would result from this proposed development, would make this route hazardous for those not in vehicles.

• There is an existing approved planning application in place for some 64 houses to be built on land associated with the Tannery light industrial unit. I propose that the Council give serious consideration to this fact in determining the validity of an additional residential development at Clockbarn. Should the Clockbarn development be approved, the number of residential dwellings that could be constructed along this 1/2 mile section of Tannery Lane is excessive and unwarranted.

• I propose that the Council also take into account the recent approval of the marina development, again adjacent to the Tannery light industrial units. Whilst not approved for any residential dwellings, the facilities proposed will give rise to an increase in traffic, both of private and commercial use and should be considered in conjunction with the Clockbarn proposal.

The combined and collective consequences of all of these approved and proposed developments along Tannery Lane will have an irreversible impact on a Surrey country lane that does not have the capacity to accommodate the overenthusiastic interpretation of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This is due to the inadequate access and traffic issues that will arise surrounding roads including Tannery Lane which is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous for vehicles trying to join the main road and permission has previously been given for apartments at the tannery and for building at the marina both of which will generate further heavy traffic. These roads can not take any more and the junctions is already dangerous so please do not allow this site to be developed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
only. At the entrance to Tannery Lane a combination of residences and a motor business mean that a number of vehicles can regularly be seen parked on both sides of the Lane, as indeed are they often along Send Road. This is a very often a very difficult junction to get in and out of during the working week and would be made much worse by the addition of 64 houses. In the opposite direction the road is much more of a single track, with little opportunity of expansion. This really hasn’t been thought through at all. Given that I believe planning permission has already been granted for the Marina along Tannery Lane - which will undoubtedly generate traffic - I do not see this as at all feasible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2918  Respondent: 10920961 / Mark Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane. It now appears that you are planning to build sixty homes instead of the 45 originally suggested. This is a 33% increase instead of a reduction which would suit that particular site. Sixty houses are far too many. It will ensure that current traffic problems in Tannery Lane are made even worse and the extra surface water will add to the potential flooding problems which exist.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5854  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2288  Respondent: 10921633 / Emma Loosley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7425  Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and increased traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and winding, with limited passing places and visibility, to take any further traffic loads. The junction with Send Road is already over-crowded and hazardous both when turning in to Tannery Lane, or exiting on to Send Road. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will already create additional burdens on the tiny lane and its traffic load and further development will only exacerbate this situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1614  Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic. The junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road is even now extremely dangerous with heavy lorries accessing Send Business Park. Tannery lane is very narrow and winding, there are no hard paved footpaths on the roads leading to this site including Tannery Lane, Papercourt Lane and Polesden Lane, so the elderly and those with prams have to walk on the road dodging traffic. Permission has already been unfortunately granted for a Marina and 64 apartments both of which, when built; will further increase traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2866  Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- There is an increase in the number of homes now planned which ignores previous objections raised by local people, that there should be no development at all on this site.
- It worsens access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the junction with Send Road.
- It will spoil the views of the countryside especially along the River Wey and further reduce the Green Belt around the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2822</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922689 / Kathleen Grehan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic and will only lead to even further congestion on to Send Road. I live further along Send Road and can confirm that this road is already over its maximum capacity of traffic. Every day traffic is at a ‘stand still’ outside my house and I have to endure the fumes. Many times in one week I have to wait patiently to be allowed out of my drive. Also our school and doctors’ surgery are already over stretched.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7488</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3804</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924641 / Ben Yates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/820  **Respondent:** 10924897 / Louis Botha  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A42 – Clockbarn:

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn. The available road infrastructure simply cannot support it. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any substantial traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3365  **Respondent:** 10925217 / AW Winterborne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 45 houses at clock barn nursery

main reason being; the inadequate access and traffic noise and light pollution, tannery lane is far too narrow and tight/ twisty to take that volume of traffic. the junction that connects it to send is already gridlocked and residents would like to make send a bit more quieter at times, although its one of the main roads leading of the A3, putting more traffic on that road will eventually back up to the a3 and cause even more rush hour traffic issues.

I OBJECT to 45 houses at clock barn nursery

main reason being; the inadequate access and traffic noise and light pollution, tannery lane is far too narrow and tight/ twisty to take that volume of traffic. the junction that connects it to send is already gridlocked and residents would like to make send a bit more quieter at times, although its one of the main roads leading of the A3, putting more traffic on that road will eventually back up to the a3 and cause even more rush hour traffic issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores the innumerable previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in the village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and is already too much
- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people that live in Send
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
- The local school and doctor’s surgery are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Clock Barn Nursery allocation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7329  Respondent: 10936929 / William McGowan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is an inadequate thoroughfare to access this site due to its narrowness and bends. It currently already supports heavy traffic. It frequently floods during rainfall, largely owing to the poor condition of the road. The junction with Send Road is already hazardous enough, with speeding cars driving through as they exit the A3. On top of all the foregoing, heavy traffic will be generated by the proposed 64 apartments at the Tannery and the building of the marina.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5837  Respondent: 10937025 / Louise McGowan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery because of inadequate access. As planning permission for 64 apartments and for the building of a marina in Tannery Lane has already been given, to grant further development would be a disaster as it would result in excessive traffic volume at the junction with Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6754  Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery. I live on Tannery Lane which is unsuitable for an increase in traffic and is becoming increasingly hazardous for pedestrians and dog walkers. My hedge at the front has been regularly driven into. The junction with Send Road can be a nightmare to get out of as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3741</th>
<th>Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very concerned about the effect on traffic and particularly Tannery Lane and the surrounding roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase from 45 to 60 homes is too much and a smack in the teeth for locals who have objected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will worsen Tannery Lane traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6661</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7194</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: pslp172/7</td>
<td>Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5137</th>
<th>Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the suggestion that 45 houses could be built at Clockbarn Nursery. The junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road is already hazardous and Tannery Lane far too narrow to cope with even more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2820</th>
<th>Respondent: 10951489 / Lorna M Cave</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A 42 where you have increased the homes to be built there from 45 to 60. As I said previously Tannery Lane and the junction with Send Road is too narrow and very dangerous to have anymore traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3505</th>
<th>Respondent: 10952161 / Alison Humberstone</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this proposal as anyone who lives in Send who uses Tannery Lane knows the small rural lane is utterly unsuitable for further developments to take place, turning into Send Road from Tannery takes an age and is difficult to
exit to send Road. You have already allowed, despite objections which I assume were again just ignored, a Marina no one wanted and which we all knew was a precursor to further development requests. Not only have we been ignored, but you have this time decided to INCREASE the number of houses for the site by 30 odd%. The impact on traffic, the green belt, amenities and the area itself makes this a completely unacceptable development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4203</th>
<th>Respondent: 10953793 / Hugh Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on the Clockbarn site in Send (ref A42) which is designated as agricultural land within the Green Belt. The fact that it has been allowed to deteriorate should not be a passport to changing its status. It is not suitable because it has poor access and the road cannot take the additional vehicular traffic which 45 houses would generate.

I OBJECT to the Building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because the road already suffers from serious overload, as previously accepted by Surrey County Council. An additional 45 houses would increase the number of dwellings in Tannery Lane by nearly 400% because planning permission already exists for 63 apartments at the Tannery business centre site under reference 14/P/00575 and 00576 as amended. It is disingenuous for GBC to express the belief that these may not be built. GBC gave permission and the owner has the right and locally it is understood the intention of building them. Indeed work has commenced. Added to this would be the traffic generated by building and servicing the new narrow boat basin or “marina” under reference 14/P/00289. The road cannot cope with the traffic volume it currently has and could not possibly accommodate the massive increase in vehicular traffic consequent on these three developments. In simple terms if the number of dwellings increased by 400% so would the volume of domestic traffic in addition to an increase in commercial traffic. This does not bear thinking about.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because this massive increase in traffic would severely impact the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road where there is a problem every day because of poor visibility for traffic emerging from the side road causing danger and congestion to traffic on the main road. The suggestion that this would be alleviated by traffic lights is completely wrong as the installation of temporary traffic lights in Send Road earlier this month demonstrated. When traffic has to stop in either direction, as it does for traffic lights, Send Road quickly gets gridlocked.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because it fails to take into account the cumulative impact on traffic volumes in the rest of Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is very narrow, twisty and dangerous for its entire length. Much of it is single track with passing places and blind spots. There is a problem all the way down with vehicles trying to pass each other. When they meet they very often have to reverse in order to find a passing place. The problem is exacerbated by the high proportion of HGVs and large commercial vehicles currently going to the business centre, and destined to increase when the narrow boat basin is built. Tannery Lane is also very long. The biggest problem, which is often overlooked because planners fail to go there, is the stretch beyond the business centre going north. The final stretch of Tannery Lane before it joins Polesden Lane is only 9 feet wide for a distance of nearly 400 metres and cannot be made wider because of the nature reserve. A significant proportion of the traffic, estimated at about one third, enters Tannery Lane via Polesden Lane or Papercourt Lane which are themselves extremely narrow, especially Papercourt where some of the front garden boundaries on either side of the road are within little more than three metres of each other. There is also the extremely dangerous blind bend to the right when joining Newark Lane. These lanes were not meant for the high number of cars, vans and lorries which currently use them and could not possibly cope with an increase of the amount which would follow from this development, on top of the others.
The suggestion sometimes made that Tannery Lane could be widened totally fails to appreciate the constraints which exist. Any attempt to widen it would be defeated by the fact that the entrance from Send Road does not provide space for any significant widening; the Papercourt Lane exit is so narrow that front gardens on both sides of the lane would have to be compulsorily purchased; the stretch from Prews Farm Cottages to Papercourt Farm runs immediately alongside Papercourt Marshes so there is no scope for widening and in any event further traffic would damage Papercourt Marshes; the stretch from Papercourt Farm to the junction with Polesden Lane is single track nine feet wide which also runs alongside Papercourt Marshes. In any event a widening of Tannery and Papercourt by itself would be insufficient - because of the bends it would need to be straightened as well, a hugely expensive and well-nigh impossible task. In the whole of the Borough of Guildford, if one set out to find somewhere to build houses, Tannery Lane would be close to the bottom of the list of potential sites from the point of view of road access.

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses on Clockbarn because there are virtually no pavements. The increase in traffic would therefore mean that pedestrians would face much greater risk. The only surfaced pavement in Tannery Lane is the first short section from Send Road confined to the north side. The other side is unsurfaced. After Peasblossom Cottage (about 80 metres from the junction with Send Road) there are no further pavements on either side for its entirety. Pedestrians walk in the road and have to dodge the traffic as best they can.

In addition to vehicular traffic it is used by residents and their visitors on foot: residents from Send Road and adjacent roads walking their dogs; walking groups and ramblers (on their way to Newark Priory, Ockham Mill and the Pyrford Water Meadows); equestrians; sports and recreational cyclists (because it is in the guide books as part of the cycling network based on Ripley); and anglers who fish in the Wey Navigation. It is therefore enjoyed by a lot of people whose safety should not be further jeopardised, and for whom a village amenity should not be ruined completely, by increasing any more the excessive number of vehicles the road already has to cope with.

Tannery Lane is an ancient rural road which is rich in wildlife which should not be damaged by pollution caused by increased traffic volumes. Clockbarn itself is a nesting habitat for bats which are a protected species, making it not only unsuitable to build there but a criminal offence to do so. Additional traffic pollution and noise alongside Papercourt Marshes will be detrimental to wildlife there too.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because all the land in that area is prone to flooding. Although the Environment Agency maps include the area in flood zone 1 the reality is different, as a great deal of photographic evidence and local testimony can show.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? 

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** psp172/1415  **Respondent:** 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

Proposed Allocation: 45 Houses

Response: Objection

- Proposed site is Green Belt. All Green Belt Land must be protected.

- Adverse affect on quality of life for existing local residents and the character of the locality.

- Local infrastructure is totally inadequate.

- Link road network not adequate: There are queues at Peak times on the A247 at the Old Woking roundabout, the Burnt Common roundabout, the B2215 through Ripley and getting on or off at some local A3 Junctions, especially leading to the M25 Junction 10.

- Tannery lane itself is very narrow and in parts single track. Papercourt lane and Polesdon lane leading on from Tannery Lane are also very narrow/single track. Cyclists and, with great care, walkers (sometimes backing into busses to let cars go past) use these lanes as there is access to the river Wey lowpath. These lanes are not suitable for increased vehicular activity.

- The junction with Send road (A247) is hazardous. There was a previous suggestion of putting traffic lights at the junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road. If this proposal still exists, it is not viable. There are already traffic lights just as a short distance away at the main crossroads with Send Marsh Road, Send Hill and Send Barns Lane. A second set of lights would cause even more congestion than at present.

- Adverse impact on the natural environment, including visual.

- Site near special protection area.

- More pollution - light, noise, air

- Tannery Lane not served by public transport. Last bus back to Send from Woking mainline railway station id 19:30 HRS which is far too early. No buses through Send road/Send Marsh road on a Sunday.

- Potential for increased crime and nuisance (nearest Police station was in Ripley but has now been closed).

- Community issue: the medical centre in Send Barns Lane is shared with Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley and is consequently very busy. There can often be a wait of up to 7-10 days for a standard appointment. No public transport operates along Send Barns Lane to the medical centre.

Surrounding Road Network:

- The traffic along the A3 is at a standstill most weekdays between Burpham and the A31 Hogsback Junction.
- If there are any major incidents on the M25 or A3, the local roads are even more congested than normal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2751</th>
<th>Respondent: 10957313 / R Holmes</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amended policy has increased the number of homes from approximately 45 homes (C3) to approximately 60 homes (C3) and therefore all my objections from the original response still remain.

I mentioned in my original response that for anyone using public transport, the last bus back to Send from Woking mainline railway station was 1930hrs which was far too early and no bus service runs through Send Road/Send Marsh Road on a Sunday. Since writing that response, the last bus back to Send from Woking mainline railway station has been cut to 1820hrs!! also, from Guildford, the last bus that goes through Send has been cut and now leaves Guildford at 1825hrs.

For existing Send commuters/daytrippers the public transport to/from rail stations was not good enough and mean they have to use their cars. These cuts make is even more abysmal. This policy (A42) would mean an increase in cars on the roads as people from any new development in Send would also need to use their cars.

One of the changes that the council has made in its ‘Local Plan 2017 – Policy ID3: sustainable transport for new developments’ is:-

(2)(d) The provision and improvement of public and community transport.

Send has had their public transport bus timetable cut and I couldn’t find under the ‘Local Plan 2017 – Infrastructure Schedule – BT Bus Transport’ any mention of bus improvements for Send.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| **Attached documents:** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1565</th>
<th>Respondent: 10957441 / Christopher Hunter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A42 Tannery Lane. The roads cannot cope with this increase in houses and the many precious objections have again been ignored.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| **Attached documents:** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3520</th>
<th>Respondent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Attached documents:** |
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the proposed development of the Clockbarn estate in close proximity to Garlick’s Arch. Tannery Lane is very narrow and cannot take existing HGV traffic which seeks to divert into Polesden Lane, and Newark Lane, placing people and infrastructure in peril – the bridges have only been rebuilt in the very recent past and Newark Lane as it joins Ripley High Street is extremely narrow. In addition to the permission granted for 64 houses at the Tannery site, and developments at the marina, the Tannery Lane, Papercourt Lane and Polesden Lane simply cannot take any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6480  **Respondent:** 10968481 / Vivienne Ottaway  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery for the following reason:

- there is inadequate access : Tannery Lane is far too narrow and the junction with Send Road is hazardous

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6597  **Respondent:** 10968481 / Vivienne Ottaway  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A42

4) I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery for the following reason:

- there is inadequate access : Tannery Lane is far too narrow and the junction with Send Road is hazardous

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2905  **Respondent:** 10969601 / Jenny Paviour  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging
into the main road. Planning permission as already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take anymore.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2527  Respondent: 10969985 / Guy Middleton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1880  Respondent: 10970817 / Lee Crane  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn nursery in Tannery Lane because the increase of 15 homes takes the count to 60 homes is way too high for the area and will put the surrounding infrastructure under pressure ignoring hundreds of previous objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2886  Respondent: 10972385 / M.E. Firingstein  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the latest changes to plans for the above villages.

1. GARLICK’S ARCH (POLICY A43) KILN LANE SENDMARSH.
2. CLOCKBARN NURSERY IN TANNERY LANE, SEND (POLICY A422)
3. BURNT COMMON – PROPOSED SITE FOR MIN: 7000sq.m. INDUSTRIAL SPACE (POLICY A58)

Whatever happened to ‘GReen’? our green belt up to now has been jealously guarded. Your intentions to [illegible word] our villages beggars belief!

The roads around this area are choked with traffic jams every whichway.

What about the need for schools, medical facilities, sewage drainage-plants: and returning to problem of extra traffic many families have 2 or 3 cars per household. and extra POLICE STATIONS? needed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/276  Respondent: 10972833 / Robin L. Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above plan in many ways as follows and below in detail:

Policy A42 - Tannery Lane

• Erosion of the Green Belt - ruining the landscape for generations to come
• The increase from 45 homes to 60 homes
• Ignores all past objections (100) made by the by locals
• Acerbates access and traffic problem at the junction of A247 and Tannery Lane
• Surface water flooding will increase

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3986  Respondent: 10984385 / Julie Cameron  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. Policy A42a: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane: I object to the proposal to build 45 new homes on this site, where flooding is a concern. This development would also increase traffic flow in this narrow and winding lane and the volume of traffic turning onto Send Road/Send Barns Lane would be increased, where traffic congestion is already at maximum capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7747  Respondent: 10990785 / Valerie Golding  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42

I OBJECT I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/646  Respondent: 10992417 / Philip Erhardt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Increase in housing from 45 -60 at site A42 Tannery Lane will further impact on the road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/178  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane as this is in a flood risk area and the access on narrow lanes cannot cope with any increase in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2164  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8057  Respondent: 11001761 / Brandon Sievering  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to inadequate access and traffic volumes. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road, there have been a number of accidents. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6633  Respondent: 11002945 / David Guthrie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1338  Respondent: 11003361 / Howard Milner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to your Policy A42,
The increase in proposed density totally ignores all previous objections, takes no account of the traffic problems that this development will create in Send village and surrounding “country” roads, it also will put greater pressure on local medical facilities and schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2946  Respondent: 11005473 / Nick Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Allocated for 60 houses in place of the previous 45 houses. Apart from being lined both sides with green fields for much of its length, Tannery Lane is a narrow route turning off from the middle of Send and where it turns off there is existing development either side adding to the traffic turning into it will cause further delays through the middle of the village and require a significant amount of infrastructure work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5259  Respondent: 11006241 / Sally Harrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal A42 concerning Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane. This is on the grounds that this is a lane, narrow in many places and not suitable for accommodating more traffic which will arise with the construction of 45 more houses. I object because the junction with Send Road is also already very difficult to navigate and I foresee potential accidents as well as congestion. I object because the construction of a marina has been granted permission already which will again increase traffic along Tannery lane. I object because there is also a flooding risk along the lane which has not been resolved. I object because of the fauna (many bats nest here) and flora which will be compromised

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3949  Respondent: 11006241 / Sally Harrison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My first objection is to Policy A42 where the number of houses proposed has increased from 45 to 60 ie an increase of 33% which is enormous.
Tannery Lane is a problem for traffic as it is, as a result of inadequate parking in Send, making the junction with Send Road difficult to navigate at most times of the day. The lane is also very narrow. As with many residential developments, inadequate parking provision for residents and their visitors will lead to them parking on Tannery Lane, aggravating the situation. Increased housing will bring even more people in cars onto the A247 which is congested at peak times and busy during the rest of the day as it is a cut through to Woking from the A3, and furthermore regularly used as a training route for HGVs. Together with the proposals for a new junction with the A3 at Burnt Common, which will bring yet more traffic through the village, this is going to be a serious problem.

This development will also impact negatively on views from the Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3195  **Respondent:** 11007713 / Grahame Crispin  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A42 (45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane Send).

Tannery Lane is too narrow to support the additional traffic that would be generated by any development that this policy provides for, the junction with Send Road will become significantly more hazardous than it already is, and the network of lanes around Papercourt and towards Ripley will become more of a cut through and dangerous.

Development of the site would destroy a valuable Green Space habitat, and destroy the buffer between Send Village and the Tannery Lane Industrial area.

The site must NOT be developed and the Policy must be abandoned

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/669  **Respondent:** 11008033 / Sandra Reeves  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because this increase from 45 to 60 homes is far too much and ignores the hundreds of prior objections made by local people against this planned development. It will lead to further traffic problems already experienced at the Tannery Lane and A247 junction and will make surface water flooding even worse. Importantly it will erode the Green Belt in our village.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1153  **Respondent:** 11008737 / Louise Whitbread  **Agent:**

**Document:**

---
I object. As a local resident I object on the grounds of strain on the local infrastructure in relation to the roads (this proposed development is off a small lane and the junction with Send Road is already difficult with existing traffic), doctor surgery & local schools.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposed building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane already has traffic problems and that is without the additional ones resulting from the proposed planning applications that have been passed. I would imagine that life for the residents would become even more intolerable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

CLOCKBARN NURSERY POLICY A42

60 homes in this area would be completely inappropriate with the existing access for Tannery Lane. This is an area of Send where congestion is already at a peak and your proposal would mean an addition of another say, 150 cars. We do not have the infrastructure for the addition of all these homes and cars. I object to this proposal.

The idea of increasing the number of houses proposed on this site is ridiculous? As someone who has lived near by for many years and [unreadable word] the traffic problem in Tannery Lane where in places the road is only wide enough to take one car. I think the community who vote [unreadable words] are without any common sense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

The idea of increasing the number of houses proposed on this site is rediculous? As someone who has lived near by for many years and [unreadable word] the traffic problem in Tannery Lane where in places the road is only wide enough to take one car. I think the community who vote [unreadable words] are without any common sense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A42 because of the impact to the village of increased housing in an area where access is via very narrow country lanes.

The addition of yet more vehicles adding to a road network that can barely cope with the current levels of traffic.

It is also a direct infringement of green belt land

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3385  Respondent: 11011041 / Alan C Burchett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery

I object to this development.

Tannery Lane is again a narrow rural lane that will suffer from the building of a Marina and 64 apartments which I believe have already been approved. So additional houses would be most unsuitable.

Send Road is far too busy as it is with frequent traffic jams that grid lock the whole village. It would be totally wrong to have any more traffic entering Send Road from any further Tannery Lane development. The junction onto Send Road from Tannery Lane is already a dangerous crossroad which cannot be improved without demolishing extremely old cottages on the left or a garage on the right. The other end of Tannery Lane is a single track that runs towards Ripley and Pyrford which could certainly take no more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2316  Respondent: 11011713 / Mary Warren  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42. Tannery Lane is an extremely winding and narrow road with little scope for increased traffic. The addition of a further 15 houses to the already planned 45 to make a total of 60 new houses will overload the access road considerably and lead to traffic jams and an increased number of accidents, some of which could be fatal. The junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road (A247) is particularly dangerous despite the new double yellow lines and is already the site of accidents. This situation will only worsen if the local plan is carried out.

As with Garlick's Arch, flooding is already a known problem along Tannery Lane and development of the size suggested will intensify this.

Once again, Guildford Borough Council are paying no attention to the Green Belt which will be further eroded by this development with loss of the openness required to protect the countryside.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3317  Respondent: 11011745 / Daniel Hill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Development of this part of Send will result in even more traffic flow on the already heavily congested A247. Furthermore, I do not think that a quiet country road, such as Tannery Lane, should be subjected to levels of traffic that it was never designed to cope with. I also note that the 60 homes are proposed on this development, representing a 33% increase on the previous number put forward. Aside from the traffic problems already outlined, this represents far too high a number.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3161  Respondent: 11011969 / Diana Gibson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more vehicle movements.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5264  Respondent: 11015617 / J Fiona Harris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is a narrow, winding road. The junction with Send Road is already hazardous for vehicles emerging to join the main road. There will already be an increase in traffic on Tannery Lane, as planning permission has previously been granted for 64 apartments to be built at the Tannery and for a Marina to be built. This little lane will not support more traffic! It would result in the junction with the main road becoming absolutely treacherous.

I request that my comments above are shown to the Planning Inspector who is responsible for deciding on the implementation of the Local Plan in respect of Send Village.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2605</th>
<th>Respondent: 11023489 / Trevor Pound</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clockburn Nursery (Policy A42):</td>
<td>I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery lane as this is in a flood risk area and the access on narrow lanes cannot cope with any increase in traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/163</th>
<th>Respondent: 11024225 / Julian Harnor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery lane as this is in a flood risk area and the access on narrow lanes cannot cope with any increase in traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2166</th>
<th>Respondent: 11024225 / Julian Harnor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1385  Respondent: 11024385 / Alison and Peter Parrott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a42 on the grounds that the amount of houses was already too much for the area and it has been increased.
the roads and access is simply not good enough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7344  Respondent: 11027137 / I Pennells  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

• The access to the site is not adequate for regular traffic and the potential volumes during construction and after construction.
• Tannery Lane is unlit and is far too narrow and bendy for 2-way traffic without footpaths, especially with the other planning permission granted for 64 apartments and a Marina further along Tannery Lane.
• The junctions joining adjacent roads are also not sufficient to take additional traffic regularly.
• The local adjoining roads do not have sufficient capacity (especially at rush hour) to take additional traffic that would be generated by this development.
• The risk of the land flooding putting housing in this area at risk and displacing the risk to adjacent existing housing unnecessarily.
• Public transport is not sufficient meeting demand of potential additional passengers to encourage vehicles to be left at home to undertake local journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3153  Respondent: 11028385 / Philippa Lawrence  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I also object to the proposal to build 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is far, far too narrow to take any more traffic. Living directly opposite this road I can inform you that this junction is already far too hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Any additional traffic would simply make the situation even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4245  Respondent: 11028481 / Emma Rowland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3585  Respondent: 11031713 / Stephen Barter  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because not only does the increase in houses from 45 to 60 ignore all the previous objections to the development, but the increase on houses of over 30% will make access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction even worse. It also increases the erosion of Green Belt in our village and will make surface water flooding even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/690  Respondent: 11031937 / Patrick Ollington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5266  Respondent: 11032385 / Celia Guthrie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn nursery. There is inadequate access to this site with Tannery Lane being too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The Junction at Send Road is already hazardous and with planning permission already granted for housing and a marina, traffic along this road is already set to increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1983  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane. 45 Houses.

As Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments (Despite strong local objection) in this narrow lane. Further development will only increase traffic to an already dangerous junction with the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/439  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane.

Because, an increase of 15 houses, making 60 in total is over the top. Development is not required or wanted.

As Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments (Despite strong local objection) in this narrow lane, single track in parts. Further development will only increase traffic to an already dangerous junction with the A247.
Because, it will impact on the views from the River Wey.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3849  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A42 Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane, I object to this policy, Tannery Lane is yet another tiny lane which already has to deal with too much traffic, and with the addition of large vehicles it will erode quickly while also causing even more congestion through Send. The River Wey navigation will have the views impeded by the building of all these houses, and why has the number of properties suddenly increased by 33%. There is also surface flooding in the area, after all it is really flood plain, so where will all the water be diverted too?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1903  Respondent: 11033825 / Peter Heath  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because it is Green Belt land (see above) and there is not sufficient access for the resulting increased traffic volume. Previously approved Planning Permissions for apartments and Marina near the Tannery will of themselves generate increased traffic volumes - the narrow lanes could not take all this increased traffic and will make the junction with Send Road all the more dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3119  Respondent: 11033985 / John Peachey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A42, I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic vofu'me. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. It is also subject to flooding. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** pslp172/591  **Respondent:** 11033985 / John Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Site A42 - I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more. It is also subject to flooding. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/623  **Respondent:** 11033985 / John Peachey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.

Increase from 45 homes (previously) to 60 homes.

This is a 33% increase in a small location, which is excessive and ignores hundreds of previous objections by local people.

It will make worse the traffic problems in the narrow and winding Tannery Lane. There has already been a successful application for 64 houses at the Marina further down Tannery Lane and another application is pending to build houses on the garage site on the corner.

The junction with Tannery Lane and the A247 Send Road is notoriously difficult to negotiate. The bad surface water flooding in the Lane will become worse.

It will adversely affect the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2227  **Respondent:** 11034817 / Nick Pycraft  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A42. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send.

Increase from 45 homes (previously) to 60 homes.

This is a 33% increase in a small location, which is excessive and ignores hundreds of previous objections by local people.

It will make worse the traffic problems in the narrow and winding Tannery Lane. There has already been a successful application for 64 houses at the Marina further down Tannery Lane and another application is pending to build houses on the garage site on the corner.

The junction with Tannery Lane and the A247 Send Road is notoriously difficult to negotiate. The bad surface water flooding in the Lane will become worse.

It will adversely affect the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses in Tannery Lane, an area already unsuited to further development, due to both its frequent flooding and the narrow and winding lane. The lane simply cannot take the traffic an additional 45 houses would bring.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2916  Respondent: 11035809 / Trevor Osborn  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane to building 60 houses. The local infrastructure in Tannery Lane will not cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/693  Respondent: 11036321 / Vinciane Ollington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4246  Respondent: 11036417 / Len Ozanne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 45 house development at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is not a road that can accept the increased traffic and the junction on to Send Road is awkward and dangerous as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1251  Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7221</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036737 / Charley Penny</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because this has increased the proposed housing from 45 to 60 homes on a road with very restricted access being effectively single lane in places and an already congested and dangerous road junction with the A247 - despite hundreds of previous objections by Send residents. This is also an area prone to serious surface water flooding which can only get worse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3225</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036801 / Judith Mercer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I further object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nurseries (A42). The access to this site is inadequate as Tannary Lane and Papercourt Lane are very narrow and with the proposed plans for a Marina as well, these roads simply will not be able to cope.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/737</th>
<th>Respondent: 11036993 / Natalie Ollington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery  
I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes because  
-it has ignored hundreds of objections from local people  
-it will erode Green Belt in the village to the overall detriment to the openness of Green Belt in the borough  
-the need for these houses has not been proven or verified as the housing target has been found to be incorrect, inflated and ignores constraints  
-housing need does not amount to” exceptional circumstances “ in accordance with NPPF guidance  
-the disregard of constraints of roads and risk of overdevelopment after many objections.  
-the draft plan should on the contrary put in place protections for this site, to stop inappropriate development, to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area which involves Green Belt. In view of the above I submit that this policy in its present form continues to be misguided and I object to it being in the local plan 2017. | | |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? | Attached documents: | |
The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7400  Respondent: 11037313 / Debbie Greener  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - Tannery Lane is too small to cope with the extra traffic and the junction with Send Road is already very dangerous and cars have to pull out into the oncoming traffic to get out as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3289  Respondent: 11037313 / Debbie Greener  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The permanence of the open River Way countryside will be permanently lost. Quite clearly that is counter to the key tenets of the NPPF. There are no exceptional circumstances.
• Yet again you are ignoring the clear concerns of local people. Why?
• Tannery lane is not appropriate for the development you seem determined to allow. Why don’t you come and have a look at the narrow nature of the lane (it is a lane) that is wholly unsuitable for the amount of additional traffic that would be generated.
• There is a 33% increase in homes. Why? This ignores the wishes of local people and exacerbates the above problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1087  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3852  **Respondent:** 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) especially proposing that there be an increase from 45 to 60 homes. Are there also proposals to help with the increased build-up of traffic? Building these houses will destroy the beautiful open countryside and increase the risk of flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2954  **Respondent:** 11041569 / Peter Belton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 - both to the original 45 homes and the 33% increase to 60 homes, as this is on green-belt land; local roads are unsuitable and congested, in particular the A247 Send Road, plus Tannery Lane is too narrow for two way traffic and increased traffic flow. I know that the proposed site in Tannery Lane is subject to flooding, as a resident and walker in the area for many years.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1591  **Respondent:** 11042369 / Huw Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

Tannery Lane is a narrow and twisty lane unsuited to large volumes of traffic, and its junction with Send Road is already hazardous for vehicles leaving the lane. Send Road is already subject to traffic problems at peak periods – an increase in
traffic exiting Tannery Lane will add to these problems, especially in view of other proposals in the draft Plan (see below).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3056  **Respondent:** 11042369 / Huw Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 (a 33% increase) is excessive
- It ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local residents
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village much worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact on open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4357  **Respondent:** 11043073 / Ingrid Botha  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn. The available road infrastructure simply cannot support it. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any substantial traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/927  **Respondent:** 11044257 / Corinne Waring  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the following changes to the local planning proposal for the following reasons.
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because you have increased the number of houses by 33% which is too much and ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people. If this goes ahead it will cause traffic problems in Tannery Lane and worsen the problems at the A247 junction, erode the Green belt in the village and worsen surface water flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5418  Respondent: 11047169 / Margaret Sherborne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Tannery Lane is too narrow to cope with houses being built at Clockbarn Nursery. The junction is already difficult to navigate and more traffic will make it impossible, especially at peak times. There is existing planning permission for the marina at the Tannery and 64 apartments. The infrastructure of Tannery Lane will struggle to cope with this without any further developments.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4138  Respondent: 11047201 / Peter McGowan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is an inadequate thoroughfare to access this site due to its narrowness and bends. It currently already supports heavy traffic. Often it floods. The junction with Send Road is hazardous now. On top of all the foregoing, heavy traffic will be generated by the proposed 64 apartments at the Tannery and the building of the marina.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7256  Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I do not object to the proposed building on site A42, Clockbarn Nursery, behind Send Road and Tannery Lane, on a derelict site, provided adequate access and exit provided by improving the junction between the two roads. I will detail my specific objections below.
I OBJECT to the proposed change to policy 42, increasing from 45 to 60 the number of homes proposed for this site because:

1) the number proposed, an increase of 33% on this small site, is way too high for the existing infrastructure of the site to cope with. The turn from Tannery Lane onto the A247, Send Road, is already an extremely difficult one, with very limited visibility in both directions along the main road. At busy times of the day it is virtually impossible to emerge from the junction safely, especially if turning right. The additional vehicles using this junction from this proposed development will further exacerbate the problem. Further proposed development in the Send area under this plan will further increase the problems at this junction.

First, by adding to the traffic on the main A247 from:-

a) the proposed development at Garlick's Arch, policy A43, 400 houses as present proposed, but likely to increase in due course,

b) Send Hill, policy A44, 40 houses proposed, and

c) the proposed industrial/warehousing development at Burnt Common, policy A58, a minimum of 7,000 sq m, leading inevitably to an increase in commercial and in particular, HGVs, using Send Road to and from the site.

Second, by additional traffic using the junction from Tannery Lane to that using it at present, from one definite, and one potential source:-

the definite source - being traffic from the Cartbridge Basin Marina in Tannery Lane which is at present in course of construction,

the potential source - should Send Business Park be inset from the Green Belt as proposed at paragraph 4.3.15 - clearly this would inevitably lead to further development of this small business park in the very narrow part of Tannery Lane, with the additional traffic generated by it also having to use the junction with Send Road, A247, since the only alternative route being towards Newark Lane Ripley, with even narrower lanes to negotiate. The proposals for Send Business Park will form the subject of a separate objection in due course.

2) The sewerage system in Send is already at full capacity according to Affinity Water. Additional housing will exacerbate this problem - unless there is a proposal to increase sewage capacity. None has been made.

This policy, with its lack of any proposal for infrastructure improvements, is in direct contradiction to the words of the Council Leader, Councillor Paul Spooner, in his introduction to the Local Plan :-

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the Borough. The delivery of sites allocated in the plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure which is a key theme of our local plan".

So where is the infrastructure upgrade? - simple, there is nothing proposed.
3) This proposal utterly disregards the hundreds of objections made last year to the previous proposal at this location, for
the lesser figure of 45 homes.

4) Open views from the Wey Navigation, National Trust land, will be removed by the provision of a housing estate
between the Navigation and Send Village.

5) Run-off from the additional houses will add to the existing problem of surface water flooding in Send Road and
Tannery Lane - see comments at 2) above.

6) It is already proposed to inset Send from the Green Belt - the subject of a further objection - see post. This proposal
will further reduce the semi-rural nature of the village, to its detriment.

It should not be assumed that, by objecting to the additional 15 homes proposed at this location, that I am by implication,
agreeing to the original proposal for 45 homes at this site. I am merely confining my objections to what I am permitted to
object to at this stage of the process.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and far too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery – as a cyclist using Tannery lane on my daily route to work I
am well aware that the

road is not suitable for any additional volume of traffic, as will be caused by further development along this lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. We object to Policy A42, the development at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because it is too large a development for the village and will: increase the traffic problems on the A247 through Send, ignores the many previous objections, will make surface water flooding worse in the area and will impact on views from the Wey Navigation (which the Countryside Vision Strategy seems to support protecting).

Attached documents:

---

Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

Attached documents:

---

I object to this development on the Wey flood plain. Further development in this location will increase the likelihood of flooding and also increase traffic levels on Tannery and Papercourt lanes which are single track country lanes.

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1746  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to Policy A42.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/822  Respondent: 11070401 / Vicki Groden  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Clockbarn Nursery,Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object that Send’s Contribution has been increased at this site with no justification despite a reduction in overall housing numbers in the borough’s plan and the large number of objections to the previous proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3529  Respondent: 11077025 / David Williamson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change for the following reasons:

- The 33% increase from 45 to 60 homes is excessive
- This flies in the face of hundreds of objections already made by local residents
- It will only worsen traffic congestion, air pollution and dangers to residents and their families in Send, Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will set a precedent for further erosion of Green Belt in the village and surrounding areas

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4266  Respondent: 11095905 / Joanna Holden  Agent:
We object to Policy A42, the development at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because it is too large a development for the village and will: increase the traffic problems on the A247 through Send, ignores the many previous objections, will make surface water flooding worse in the area and will impact on views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery.

Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments and a Marina, both of which were widely opposed by the local community. The inadequacy of Tannery Lane and the nearby roads to cope with the additional traffic caused by this unwanted development must not be compounded by adding even more traffic if the Clockburn Nursery development is granted. This over-development must not be allowed to happen if we are to avoid appalling traffic destroying the enjoyment of this quiet village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposal to build 45 houses on Clockbarn Nursery for the following reasons. There could be another 90 odd cars on the road, and the nearest road to join would be the already crowded Send Road. The other roads are narrow country lanes which join up with a network of other narrow country lanes.

Oh! Yes! And these lanes will also be shared with the new marina on the river Wey in Tannery Lane, Send that has already been granted planning permission for 80 berths plus the buildings that will support that project.

I object to the increase in the population (together with other housing proposals) that will put additional strain on the educational and medical facilities in the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, of 60 homes in place of the 45 homes previously proposed because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it ignores the hundreds of objections already made by local people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• it will make more traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction which are already overloaded at peak travelling times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The narrow country lanes there are already under threat from the development there where the GBC has already given permission to proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable. The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane The proposed allocation for 45 homes in the previous draft plan on green belt land was objected to &amp; I object to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is unsuitable for the quantity of traffic which would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3032</td>
<td>Respondent: 11107105 / Michelle Manester</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondly, I was amazed to discover that 45 houses are being proposed at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane and object to this build. Tannery Lane is so narrow and is predominantly a one car lane that will not allow for, and support increased traffic flow. Access is difficult enough as it is and hazardous at the Send junction!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2418</th>
<th>Respondent: 11159809 / Hilary Road</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This increases the planned 45 houses to 60.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact on traffic will make an already congested area extremely difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The surface flooding in this area is already bad, has this fact been considered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has there been consideration of the need for additional medical and educational provision for these additional families?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3757</th>
<th>Respondent: 11164225 / David Avery</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is <strong>33% more</strong> and it was too much at 45 homes so 60 is totally unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ignores all the <strong>hundreds of previous objections</strong> made by local people! Why don’t you listen to the major of local people that object?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction. This junction is dangerous now!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse. You’ve already got rid of too much STOP now!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7304  Respondent: 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this development on the Wey flood plain. Further development in this location will increase the likelihood of flooding and also increase traffic levels on Tannery and Papercourt lanes which are single track country lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3236  Respondent: 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 1/3rd increase in housing from 45 (already unsustainable ) to 60. It will create traffic chaos in Tannery and Papercourt Lanes and is likely to lead to an increase in head-on collisions in these single track roads which are already too frequent. The adjacent water meadows on the flood plain just cope with current rainfall; this development could cause flooding several times a year both at the site itself and to all properties which currently lie at the edge of the flood zone.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3078  Respondent: 11550561 / Karen Lord  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, Policy A.42, Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously, I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is too much- a third more. It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people. It will put pressure on the local infrastructure and worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and Send Road. It will add to the surface water flooding that we already have a problem with. It will further alter the village becoming more urban losing more Green Belt which was to protect natural or semi natural environments and to protect unique character of rural communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7780</th>
<th>Respondent: 11832961 / The National Trust - London and SE (Rachel Botcherby)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note that this site allocation has been significantly reduced in area from the previous consultation document which is a positive step forward and welcomed by the National Trust, however, the area to the north is largely green field and open, falling within the setting of the River Wey Navigations.

The Trust will therefore continue to ensure that the special character of the landscape and views are protected or improved in line with Policy G11 of the Local Plan. We therefore request that the ‘requirements’ for the redevelopment of the site are updated to not just require a ‘sensitive design, siting and form of development, given the edge of village/semi-rural location’ but also that the design has due regard to the setting and amenity of the River Wey and the Conservation Area.

We wish to continue to be consulted on future versions of this document and any planning applications on the sites discussed above, or any others, affecting National Trust land and property.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5580</th>
<th>Respondent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object** – The proposal to build more housing on the Clockbarn site will only add to the traffic problems in this very narrow single track lane with Tannery Lane with dangerous junctions at both ends. There is already planning permission for 63 houses to be built next to Tannery House!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3373</th>
<th>Respondent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send**

**I object** – The proposal to build additional housing on the Clockbarn site will only add to the traffic and poor access problems in the very narrow single track Tannery Lane with dangerous junctions at both ends. There is already planning permission for 63 houses to be built next to Tannery House, a new Narrowboat Basin is currently being built with access on to Tannery Lane and the proposal to make Send Business Centre into a Strategic Employment Site would mean increased traffic accessing this site as well!
I have often thought that the Clockbarn site with its large derelict greenhouse could be better used as a car park for the village (which has very little parking for its village centre and recreation ground) or even could have a few properties built on it classed as affordable or social housing to help those who cannot afford to live in the village once they have left home. However I feel the number of 60 houses far exceeds what is acceptable on the Clockbarn site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3707  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.
I object to this site because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. In one direction Tannery Lane is very narrow and twisty, being reduced to single lane traffic in many spots with passing places only; in the other the junction onto Send Road is very dangerous and inadequate. Planning permission has already been given for a marina and 64 apartments which will increase the traffic greatly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3925  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this site because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. In one direction Tannery Lane is very narrow and twisty, being reduced to single lane traffic in many spots with passing places only; in the other the junction onto Send Road is very dangerous and inadequate. Planning permission has already been given for a marina and 64 apartments which will increase the traffic greatly.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2480  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes in Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send because the proposal is now for 60 homes instead of 45. Tannery Lane is not built to cope with a lot of traffic. At one end it is barely more than a one lane track with occasional passing places that floods, and at the other, the junction onto the A247 is not adequate to deal with any volume of traffic. It is a dangerous junction that gets very congested at busy times as it is. The road has surface
flooding issues, more than would be indicated from the Councils records, which local photographs show. It is also eating into the Green Belt and will affect the countryside views from the Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2872  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and increased traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and winding, with limited passing places and visibility, to take any further traffic loads. The junction with Send Road is already over-crowded and hazardous both when turning in to Tannery Lane, or exiting on to Send Road. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will already create additional burdens on the tiny lane and its traffic load and further development will only exacerbate this situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/300  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase by 33% of homes to be developed, from 45 to 60, is too many for such a small area. It ignores all my previous objections to this proposal and, in fact, has made it worse than before even though I, and many others, objected strongly to this proposal. It worsens traffic issues in Tannery Lane, which is already a small single lane in places, and erodes the green belt. There is increased risk of flooding due to surface run off and it will affect the natural topology and countryside around the area which has already been designated as Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1103  Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery
The number of proposed homes has increased from 45 to 60, a 33% increase which is too many for this site.
It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

It will continue the erosion of the Green Belt around Send which must be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2844  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42 this is now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously.
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3661  Respondent: 15067585 / Ann Elms  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have already objected in previous consultations to the Local Plan but this latest draft has become just plain ridiculous.
Why is Send bearing the brunt of development and why isn't there development south of Guildford, where I believe a lot of the councillors live?? To move to detail, here are my objections to the latest proposals.

I object to Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, where the number of houses has been increased to 60, instead of 45. This is just plain madness. The local infrastructure will not support such a huge development, which is 33% more than what was previously proposed, and that was far too much. Traffic will be gridlocked every morning throughout Send, right through Send Road and Send Barns Lane. It is frequently at a complete stand still every workday morning already and it will be impossible to circulate in Send at rush-hour times.

The Green Belt will be eroded and Send will no longer be a village but will become a suburb of Woking and Guildford. The whole atmosphere will be completely changed in the village. The beautiful open countryside views from the River Wey will be ishot for ever with this badly planned over-development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/167  Respondent: 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 because this amendment is a 33% increase to the original plan putting even more stress on local infrastructure and totally ignoring the hundreds of previous objections made. This increase will also add to already bad traffic problems and is eroding more Green Belt. Apart from impacting on the views from the Wey Navigation it will undoubtedly have a serious effect on already bad flooding in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1924  Respondent: 15080865 / Adar Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of Burnt Common our area has been threatened with irreversible and excessive development on all sides completely destroying what is left of our rural landscape.

I object to policy a42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because;

there has been a 33% increase in planned new homes from 45 to 60 ignoring hundreds of previous objections and adding to traffic congestion at the a247 junction. Contributing to increased surfaced water flooding which already exists. It will impact on the countryside surrounding the river wey navigation and it is greenbelt land which should not be built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/352  Respondent: 15081281 / Sabine Marke-Deleau  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2214  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

41 POLICY A42 CLOCKBARN NURSERY

41.1 I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery

41.2 There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

41.3 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.

41.4 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.

41.5 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

41.6 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

41.7 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2238  Respondent: 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter)  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 I object to the changed policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery to 60 homes.
1.2 It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
1.3 The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much.
1.4 It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
1.5 It will make erosion of Green Belt in our village worse
1.6 It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
1.7 It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
1.8 The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area.
1.9 The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most of its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical.
1.10 Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic.
1.11 Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.
1.12 The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1619  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1192  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of Burnt Common our area has been threatened with irreversible and excessive development on all sides completely destroying what is left of our rural landscape.

I object to policy a42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because;

there has been a 33% increase in planned new homes from 45 to 60 ignoring hundreds of previous objections and adding to traffic congestion at the a247 junction. Contributing to increased surfaced water flooding which already exists. It will impact on the countryside surrounding the river wey navigation and it is greenbelt land which should not be built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1831  Respondent: 15099489 / Christine Vinten  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Policy A42

I object to the change to Policy A42 because this shows a 1/3 increase in the number of homes and ignores the previous objections raised by local people. This will worsen traffic problems along Tannery Lane and the junction with the A247. Further erosion of the Green Belt is unwarranted and this will impact the countryside views from the Wey Navigation canal/river.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1680  Respondent: 15099745 / Duncan Vinten  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Policy A42

I object to the change to Policy A42 because this shows a 1/3 increase in the number of homes and ignores the previous objections raised by local people. This will worsen traffic problems along Tannery Lane and the junction with the A247. Further erosion of the Green Belt is unwarranted and this will impact the countryside views from the Wey Navigation canal/river.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/358</th>
<th>Respondent: 15102049 / Malcolm Holland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 because
1. previous objections ignored
2. increase in homes to much
3. increase traffic problems
4. reduction in the green belt
5. increased flooding problems

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1384</th>
<th>Respondent: 15102497 / Alison Parrott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above as the amount of homes has increased and there were already too many, taking into account the worsening of traffic in Tannery Lane and on the A247 junction with it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2512</th>
<th>Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 houses in place of 45 homes is not in keeping with the rural area and Tannery Lane is very narrow and is not sufficiently wide enough to carry the significant increase in traffic. It is already treacherous at points along the lane and it will impact the open countryside
views and will unnecessarily erode the Green Belt status of the area. The Marina development has already been given the go ahead and the area cannot cope with more building development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3844</th>
<th>Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 houses in place of 45 homes is out of character and not in keeping with the rural setting. Tannery Lane is extremely narrow and not wide enough to carry significant increases in traffic. It is already dangerous along the lane and will impact the open countryside views and will unnecessarily erode the Green Belt status of the area. The Marina development has already been approved and the area will be saturated if there is more building development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2550</th>
<th>Respondent: 15109121 / Larry Bottomley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase in homes ignores all previous comments, will worsen the chronic traffic problems through Send and associated roads, and makes no provision for increase in supporting social infrastructure in local schools, surgeries, roads or public transport. This development requires an expansion of existing local GPs Practices (none referenced in Section 6, Health and Social Care), an increase in Early, Primary and Secondary Education provision (none referenced in Section 4 Education), and material traffic management measures throughout Ripley, Send and Clandon (other than LRN7 and LRN20 none referenced in Section 1, Transport).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1280</th>
<th>Respondent: 15114017 / Jo Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the change to Policy A42 at Clockbarn, Tannery Lane as:-
1. There are an additional 15 houses, the local roads will not be able to cope with the additional traffic causing congestion and safety issues for local children walking to school and playing.
2. The land is Green Belt
3. It will increase the risk of surface water flooding in the local area, which is already an issue
4. The local infrastructure is not in place for the increase in housing e.g. the medical centre is already at capacity and Send Primary size cannot be increase to accommodate the additional intake.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to your proposals for an increase in the already worryingly high number of homes to be built in Tannery Lane as this would cause unacceptable levels of traffic in this area. I also feel that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the Papercourt Nature Reserve which plays an important part in the conservation of birds, animals and plants.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1063  Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 proposal change in Tannery Lane on the grounds that firstly it erodes the Green Belt in our village along with some other plans for the area, but just as important the density of housing is too great for the village. So no additional housing should be contemplated anyway. The lane itself is narrow and the junction into the main village road inevitably will increase hold ups and delays, in turn will increase pollution from the resulting extra traffic, which in turn is putting too much pressure on the road through Send, already a main route to Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1067  Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear sir or Madam,

I object to the Policy A42 proposal change in Tannery Lane on the grounds that firstly it erodes the Green Belt in our village along with some other plans for the area, but just as important the density of housing is too great for the village. So no additional housing should be contemplated anyway. The lane itself is narrow and the junction into the main village road inevitably will increase hold ups and delays, in turn will increase pollution from the resulting extra traffic, which in turn is putting too much pressure on the road through Send, already a main route to Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1016  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Dear sir or Madam,

I object to the Policy A42 proposal change in Tannery Lane on the grounds that firstly it erodes the Green Belt in our village along with some other plans for the area, but just as important the density of housing is too great for the village. So no additional housing should be contemplated anyway. The lane itself is narrow and the junction into the main village road inevitably will increase hold ups and delays, in turn will increase pollution from the resulting extra traffic, which in turn is putting too much pressure on the road through Send, already a main route to Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a devastating impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send and Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/139  Respondent: 15136641 / Jason Dack  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Tannery Lane, I particularly object to the proposal to inset Send Business Park from the Green Belt Tannery Lane and the surrounding roads are already under pressure from disproportionately high traffic. Further expansion or development will hugely detract further from the green belt and current feeling of relative rural peace.

I and my family, neighbours and local residents will continue to pursue our objections for as long as it takes

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1807  Respondent: 15137697 / Phil Goodman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7294  Respondent: 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery (Policy A42) because Tannery Lane is too narrow, and is inadequate for more vehicles. I myself was once nearly in collision with another car there, even though both vehicles were observing the speed limit. The other vehicle came round a sharp bend at speed, swerved to avoid my car (which by then was stationary) and damaged a wheel against the kerb.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3427  Respondent: 15142977 / Paulina Adair  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 proposing to build 60 new homes instead of 45 home in Tannery Lane. We, the residents of Send, have objected to previously 45 houses. To increase the number to 60 houses would make the situation even worse with the traffic problems and the further erosion of the Green Belt. When reading the proposal, it makes me think that the planners have never visited the area around the Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2883  Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes to Policy A42 at Clockbarn in Tannery lane.

The houses have now increased from 45 to 60, that's a 33% rise.

GBC have totally ignored the hundreds of objections to this site. Tannery lane is a small country lane, it suffers from surface water flooding, it has no footpaths nor street lighting and is single track in its entire length! The road is a country lane! You drive along it with extreme care, as speeding motorists using it as a cut through while using a sat nav, forcing you into the hedges and up the banks. Tannery lane joins the A247 at a dangerous crossroads, where you have to edge out in hope you don't hit a speeding car on the busy main road! The newly painted double yellow lines prove worthless as cars still park on them making the sight lines dangerous!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/249  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A42 – I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Apart from this area being subject to potential surface water flooding this will just bring more traffic onto the A247 Send Road or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2537  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change in policy which has increased the number of houses to 60 (33% more) from the previously proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This area is subject to surface water flooding which this will exacerbate and will bring even more traffic onto the A247 Send Road. This will either create a bottleneck at the junction of the A247 and Tannery Lane or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

This policy change will increase the erosion of the Green Belt in our village and will impact upon open countryside views around the precious River Wey navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3293  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change in policy which has increased the number of houses to 60 (33% more) from the previously proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This area is subject to surface water flooding which this will exacerbate and will bring even more traffic onto the A247 Send Road. This will either create a bottleneck at the junction of the A247 and Tannery Lane or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

This policy change will increase the erosion of the Green Belt in our village and will impact upon open countryside views around the precious River Wey navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1530  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
How can it be acceptable to increase the amount of houses from 45 to 60 at Site 42 Tannery Lane? This is an extremely narrow road which cannot cope with the size of this development. In turn, this will have a grave impact on the surrounding local and rural roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/831</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>15146049 / Ian Tulloch</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the changes to Policy A42 at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:-

- The increase of 33% in the number of homes is too great.
- The previous objections by local people have been ignored.
- Traffic problems in Tannery Lane will be considerably worsened.
- The erosion of the Green Belt will be unacceptably increased.
- Flooding risk, already bad, will become worse.
- There will be a negative impact on the countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/2201</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>15146945 / E J M Symonds</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again Send is being targeted with an inappropriate number of houses in a Green Belt area, where our roads, medical facilities and school are not up to coping with [illegible word] and needs.

I strongly object to Policy A.42 on the grounds that it is Greenbelt and the access on to the A247 is already lethal and a further 60 – not 45 as primarily planned, houses would be dangerous. It is a narrow country lane.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3665</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>15148705 / Catriona Wilkinson</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 2017 Draft Local Plan now proposes an increase in the development envisaged in the 2016 Draft Local Plan. 60 homes are now planned in place of the 45 homes originally proposed— an increase of one third. This completely ignores previous objections to the traffic problems which will be caused by this development on a site which is served by very narrow roads and the increase in the number of homes now proposed can only make matters worse. It will also increase the impact of surface water flooding which is already a problem in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/286</th>
<th>Respondent: 15172705 / Geraldine Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy A42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because 33% increase in the number of houses on that land is too much. Where are all the children going to go to school? You've pulled down the school and placed the children in a eyesore of a school. The playground is so small the children can't run around without banging into someone. It ignores all the previous complaints against the plans. Tannery Lane is way to narrow to cope with the flow of traffic in that area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/586</th>
<th>Respondent: 15174145 / Kathleen Mylet</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I object to Policy A42 at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. An increase of 33% on the number of houses to be built is outrageous. The road is too narrow and difficult to traverse most days without adding even more houses to the original plan. |

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/209</th>
<th>Respondent: 15177313 / Stephen Brunskill</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| |
I object to Policy A42 primarily because it is an erosion of the green belt and will spoil open countryside along the Wey Navigational. In addition the access road i.e. Tannery lane is a narrow country lane with passing places for oncoming traffic. 60 houses with an average of 2 cars per house will put an unrealistic strain on the road. Also the junction of tannery lane at either end is wholly unsuitable to this amount of traffic and will cause traffic issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3401  Respondent: 15178369 / Geoffrey Wilkinson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The 2017 Draft Local Plan now proposes an increase in the development envisaged in the 2016 Draft Local Plan. 60 homes are now planned in place of the 45 homes originally proposed– an increase of one third. This completely ignores previous objections to the traffic problems which will be caused by this development on a site which is served by very narrow roads and the increase in the number of homes now proposed can only make matters worse. It will also increase the impact of surface water flooding which is already a problem in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1649  Respondent: 15180193 / Paul Bedworth  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42

a. A 33% increase in the number of homes when there were so many objections to the original 45 makes no sense whatsoever. The process is illogical and appears to be designed to bulldoze plans through which is undemocratic.

b. It will worsen access and traffic problems at the junction of Tannery Lane and A247 junction. Vehicular access to Tannery Lane is extremely limited.

c. It will worsen water flooding which is already bad.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2054  Respondent: 15183393 / D Greenman  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to Policy A42 as the number of homes planned has been increased from 45 to 60 homes. This is an increase of 33% and ignores all previous objections from the residents of Send. Tannery Lane is a single track narrow lane which already has traffic and access problems, to add potentially another 120 cars to this road will only increase the chance of road rage and the possibility of a nasty incident. The Policy will erode more Green Belt. As Guildford Borough Council is a Conservative Constituency who promised not to build on Green Belt - this is totally unacceptable, remember it is the Send residents who helped put you into power and can easily remove you. There is continual flooding in this area and building homes on this land will add to run off and cause additional flooding and distress to householders. The countryside around Send and the rural feel of the area will be lost, this is part of the attraction of Send, residents will not allow this to be ruined.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2536  Respondent: 15186305 / Joe Strudwick  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the change in policy which has increased the number of houses to 60 (33% more) from the previously proposed 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This area is subject to surface water flooding which this will exacerbate and will bring even more traffic onto the A247 Send Road. This will either create a bottleneck at the junction of the A247 and Tannery Lane or feed it through narrow and single track rural roads towards Newark Lane.

This policy change will increase the erosion of the Green Belt in our village and will impact upon open countryside views around the precious River Wey navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/618  Respondent: 15192481 / Thomas Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of this site within the local plan. Development of this site will be used to justify future development plans in the area that will have a significant impact on the semi-rural location that the plans specifies; while careful design can mitigate the immediate impact, I believe that it would have significant impact on the area in the longer-term. Access to the site will be via Tannery Lane that will experience a greater volume of traffic in the near future following the approval of plans for 64 apartments at the tannery and building of the Marina and any further development at Clockbarn nursery would further exacerbate this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1391  Respondent: 15192481 / Thomas Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change as the increased number of homes proposed for the Clockbarn nursery site fails to account for the previous objections to the original 45 houses proposed for this site. I am concerned that it will have a significant negative impact upon traffic along tannery lane and, in particular, the junction between tannery lane and the A247. I am also concerned that this development is will negatively impact upon the Wey Navigation, as it will impede what are currently open countryside views protected by the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/313  Respondent: 15196161 / Michael Corlett  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1143</th>
<th>Respondent: 15199009 / Alan Toomey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the fact that the proposed number of homes has been increased from 45 to 60 which is incredible you having had so many previous objections to this site. Tannery lane is a very narrow lane with poor and dangerous access at either end and quite unsuitable for a large development. The site is on Green Belt Land which is subject to flooding and will the development will impact on the River Wey Navigation. There are already sewage problems in this area as the local plant is unable to cope with excess rain water.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/545</th>
<th>Respondent: 15205569 / Mark Gurdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to policy A42 Clockbarn nursery tannery lane because the increase to 60 homes as even 45 homes would bring far too much traffic to a road that is nearly impossible to exit on to the main road. Assuming 2 cars per home, this would bring 120 cars which would bring grid lock to central Send. This increase completely ignores all previous objections. The locality is already subject to local flooding - which will be made worse, which the developers will get away with, the local council will ignore and the local residents have to put up with yet again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/552</th>
<th>Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more. Where is your transport provision study.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1394  Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 of the Local Plan because you have ignored my original objection and increased the number of houses from 45 to 60 houses. This will further increase the traffic entering Send Barnes Road. This road and intersection is already too narrow to take the existing traffic. The footpath at the nearby traffic lights is far too narrow, this footpath is used by mothers and children on the way to and from school. The path is so narrow that mothers cannot walk side by side. This is an accident black spot about to happen. This development is a further erosion of the green belt, which the Prime minister has said will not happen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1717  Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
  • The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
  • It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
  • It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
  • It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
  • It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
  • It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/660  Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This requires full consultation under Regulation 18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This development will place an undue burden on local traffic flow and destroy the village of Send. The local roads are simply too small to cope with such development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I also object to 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, again the local roads are single file and are not able to carry an increase in traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would urge you to do all in your power to stop this act of ecological vandalism by Guildford Council, once the countryside has gone it will be gone forever.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A42 Tannery Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 because the increase is far too much for such a narrow lane which will never sustain the increase in traffic load particularly at the junction with A247.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make the erosion of the Green Belt worse and detrimentally affect the landscape from River Wey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

Reasons for objection to the proposals of 2016 are well documented and remain valid. An increase of a further 15 houses in addition to the original 45, representing a 33.3% increase is completely unjustified and can only exacerbate further, an already deleterious situation in the immediate locale. In addition it will contribute to worsening the situation at the A247 junction with the London Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/764  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/752  Respondent: 15236769 / Linda Aboel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has already been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina both of which will generate additional extra traffic. The junction is already too dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/755  Respondent: 15236769 / Linda Aboel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt. The Green Belt was intended to be permanent, as required my the National Planning Policy Framework, and there are no special circumstances to justify abandoning it. Send's Green Belt provides an essential buffer stopping Woking and Guildford becoming one conurbation. Local Councillors
and central government gave a clear election promise to protect the Green Belt and this reneges on it. Developers will be quick to take advantage and there will be nothing to stop them.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/775</th>
<th>Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane (Policy A42) on the grounds of inadequate access to and from the site. The roads surrounding the site are already hazardous, narrow and windy. Tannery Lane has already had planning permission granted for 64 houses and a marina and the location will not be able to cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1692</th>
<th>Respondent: 15241313 / Christine Relf</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

1) to the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% and too much for our area.
2) It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.
3) It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 Junction.
4) It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.
5) It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.
6) It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/897</th>
<th>Respondent: 15248161 / Fabio Ligi</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to additional construction on Tannery Lane. There is already planning permission for building there but the road there is very narrow and additional development should be out of the question. This is a quiet country lane which we use to walk the dogs. It adjoins the canal and to widen this road and turn it into a busy through route is incomprehensible. The entrance to this road to the main road from Ripley and Send Road is extremely narrow and cannot take further traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2287  Respondent: 15248161 / Fabio Ligi  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase from 45 homes to 60 in this area is unacceptable. This is too many for our village to support. This is a beautiful area adjoining the river and is at present a narrow country lane and access is very restricted.
- GBC have not listened to residents who know that this will create traffic havoc on Tannery lane and the A247.
- Again the erosion of the Green Belt shows the disdain with which our local council views our village and its residents concerns.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1376  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4065  Respondent: 15251105 / Michael McGrath  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
I object the change to Policy A42 because:

- This is a 33% increase on the original proposal (to which I and many hundreds of residents of Send have previously objected to) and would be even more inappropriate for reasons including increasing urbanisation, leading to unreasonable stresses on existing transport infrastructure and services, and the lack of any additional capacity for the local GP Centre and the newly amalgamated Send School.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3532</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253953 / Olivia Bedworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42 I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is far too much for local infrastructure
- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3304</th>
<th>Respondent: 15257953 / Brian Middlemiss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy A 42 to increase the number of houses on the Clock Barn Nursery site from 45 to 60 ,again with a narrow lane and open views from the River Wey Navigation along with further loss of Green Belt and possible increase in surface water flooding issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1877</th>
<th>Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn nursery in Tannery Lane because it will increase access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction. It will deplete the green belt which is in contradiction to the reason the green belt was put in place in the first place and will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1726  Respondent: 15264225 / Mel McVickers  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane Policy A 42.

I object to policy A 42 at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because.

1. It will increase the access problem for traffic in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction, which is already considered dangerous by regular users.
2. Our green belt is being taken away from us and this must not be allowed to continue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1714  Respondent: 15264449 / Elaine McVickers  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane Policy A 42.

I object to policy A 42 at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because.

1. It will increase the access problem for traffic in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction, which is already considered dangerous by regular users.
2. Our green belt is being taken away from us and this must not be allowed to continue.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8303  Respondent: 15266273 / Danescroft Land Ltd Danescroft Send LLP  Agent: Pegasus Group (Mike Spurgeon)
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please see enclosed representations and supporting documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
- LON.0500_Guildford_StratSites_Danescroft_July2016-1.pdf (329 KB)
- AssessmentofAgriculturalPotential_July2016.pdf (6.1 MB)
- SWMP_SendHotspot_Assessment_Extract.pdf (573 KB)
- LON.0500_03D_Illustrative_Masterplan_July2016.pdf (1.0 MB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2647  Respondent: 15266273 / Danescroft Land Ltd Danescroft Send LLP  Agent: Pegasus Group (Mike Spurgeon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Allocation A42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Proposed Site Allocation A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send (Page 144), is allocated for new homes (Class C3), with the gross number of homes provided over the plan period now shown as having increased from 45 homes to 60.

5.6 The increase in the number of dwellings identified in the allocation is supported. This represents a more realistic reflection of the capacity of the site to provide new housing if this is to be done in an efficient manner which optimises the nature of the opportunity that exists to do this. It is considered that the optimal capacity of the site is higher than 60 dwellings and that there remains additional capacity to provide housing at an appropriate density. Through careful and sensitive design, particularly in relation to the context provided by adjacent areas of housing, the capacity of the site and the contribution that this makes towards providing new housing whilst avoiding the need to allocate additional sites elsewhere in the Borough (particularly in more sensitive or less sustainable areas), can be maximised.

5.7 The addition of Requirement (3) in the summary table relating to Policy A42 on Page 241 of the document reflects the addition of the designation of the area as the River Wey Navigation. This amendment is welcomed since it affords appropriate recognition of the presence of the River Way Navigation and the proximity of the site to the river itself. It is acknowledged that new development would need to respect the setting of the river corridor and ensure that there is no detrimental impact.

Please see attached for context of representations.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/5214  Respondent: 15266273 / Danescroft Land Ltd Danescroft Send LLP  Agent: Pegasus Group (Mike Spurgeon)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A42: Land at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 The revised policy position in relation to the Clockbarn Nursery site which recognises its increase in capacity from 45 to 60 dwellings is welcomed. The reasoning for this outlined in the Land Availability Assessment (2017 Addendum), is that the scale of the allocation has been “Reconsidered in light of further evidence and understanding of potential capacity”.

6.2 Danescroft (Send) LLP, remain committed to achieving the redevelopment of the Clockbarn Nursery site in a manner which is appropriate to the context provided by the built form in the immediate vicinity, while continuing to make efficient use of land. This is particularly the case since other potential development sites within or adjoining Send are no longer anticipated to come forward as part of the revision of the Local Plan.

6.3 it is therefore considered that a density of approximately 25dph which would result from a development of 60 dwellings, would fail to make efficient use of land, particularly since this relates to a relatively unconstrained site immediately adjoining an existing settlement which is previously developed in character and nature.

6.4 In light of the reduction in the number and range of sites identified elsewhere in the Borough, it is considered that any new housing development should be expected to provide a higher density of housing with potential to provide up to 40dph. Initial master planning and feasibility work has confirmed that a density of 40dph can be achieved alongside the provision of on-site open space to meet the required standards. Providing new residential development at this density would also reflect the context of existing housing areas elsewhere in Send. Providing 40 dwellings per hectare would better reflect the optimum density for dwelling provision and would represent a more appropriate and sustainable quantum of development in this location, while reducing the need for additional housing to be provided in less suitable locations for development elsewhere in the Borough.

6.5 A higher density housing allocation would result in a greater number of market and affordable homes being provided. The latter would be a proportion of the overall number of dwellings being provided. Therefore, the net effect of increasing the allocation would be to increase the number of affordable homes being provided as a result of its development. The Sustainability Appraisal Report (which accompanies the Local Plan: Strategy and Sites), refers to the need to meet the full extent of both objectively assessed (OAN), and affordable housing needs, a higher rate of dwelling provision than that being promoted and planned for in the draft Local Plan would be required.

6.6 The presence of only one other allocated housing site elsewhere in Send which could be developed to provide for new housing reflects the fact that this is one of only two sites considered suitable for providing additional housing to meet local needs in the village for the duration of the plan period. In order to facilitate its development it is essential that this opportunity is maximised, particularly given the presence of Green Belt boundaries drawn tightly around the defined limits of Send where there is little scope for further development.

6.7 In conclusion, the proposed allocation of the site at Clockbarn Nursery for redevelopment as housing and its removal from the Green Belt are supported. Policy A42 identifies the site as suitable for residential development, and proposes that it is allocated for approximately 60 homes. We fully support the proposed allocation of this site for residential development which would represent a significant enhancement to the local environment as well as providing much-needed new housing. However, it is considered that the site has the potential to make a greater contribution towards the housing supply than is currently envisaged. The approach to achieving this is set out in the representations.

Conclusion

6.8 The proposed amendments to the Guildford Local Plan: Strategy and Sites are generally regarded as positive changes to the plan which more accurately reflect the potential and suitability of Site A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, to provide new housing. The increase in the housing allocation at this site from 45 to 60 dwellings reflects the reassessment of its capacity by the local planning authority and represents a recognition that this represents one of only two sites in or adjoining Send that can provide new housing for to accommodate growth over the timescale associated with the new Local Plan.

6.9 The reduction in the scale of dwelling provision across the Borough is however of some concern given the previous under-delivery of housing across the Borough and throughout the wider housing market area, as is the differential phasing of housing provision with higher rates of dwelling provision anticipated later in the plan period. Danescroft (Send) LLP
would support the use of the previous dwelling provision target of 693 as opposed to 654 in the current iteration of the plan, and for a consistent annual average to be used throughout the timescale of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: LON.0500GuildfordLocalPlanStrategyandSitesJuly2017.pdf (930 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1684 Respondent: 15284577 / Helen Whiley Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

1 A beautiful country lane, Tannery Lane, a haven amongst the huge roads nearby will become clogged with fast traffic speeding dangerously down country lanes and causing more gridlock with the A247.

2 The increase from 45 to 60 houses in unacceptable to us in the village as it will put pressure on already stretched infrastructure such as roads, schools, medical services etc.

3 This erosion of the Green Belt is a violation in my opinion. We need to preserve the green spaces for ourselves and future generations. When we decided to buy a house here it was not because the place was going to become a huge building site. We fear our house price will diminish as this become and undesirable place to live.

4 One to the attractions to moving to this area was the River Wey navigations and the beautiful countryside and views on our doorstep. This is being threatened by unnecessary development. Wildlife flourishes on the river and any encroachment on its territory is unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1331 Respondent: 15293793 / Anita Norman Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A42 – CLOCKBARN NURSERY, TANNERY LANE

The increase in the number of residential units from 45 to 60 (+15) is over a 30% uplift on a relatively small site and will lead to a cramped overdevelopment and an unacceptable increase in hardstanding to accommodate the increased parking and access roads resulting in further erosion of the Green Belt.

Tannery Lane is a narrow secondary road that in parts is almost a single track width and therefore traffic problems will be more frequent commencing with the construction of the development requiring large vehicles and plant to manoeuvre into and out of Tannery Lane.

The junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road is very restricted and requires substantial improvement to accommodate the increased use and to provide adequate safety for both pedestrians and vehicles.
The proposal would severely impact on the open aspect of the surrounding Green Belt and in particular the views from the River Wey Navigation.

The increase in units now proposed by the Council completely ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.

Recent flooding issues in and around the immediate area highlight the need for a conscience approach to development and by increasing the number of residential units on this site the incidence of flooding will be increased.

The recent approval of the planning application (14/P/02289) for the Cartbridge Traditional Narrowboat Basin on the River Wey Navigation, (construction works are now underway) already puts pressure on the Tannery Lane junctions with Polseden Lane and Send Road. Therefore the cumulative effect of both developments will result in an increase in the potential for accidents at the road junctions unless substantial highway improvements are made. Also there are over 50 parking spaces within the Cartbridge Basin application site which, together with the associated hardstanding, severely impact on the rural nature of the surrounding Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• The increase in units now proposed by the Council completely ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.
• Recent flooding issues in and around the immediate area highlight the need for a conscience approach to development and by increasing the number of residential units on this site the incidence of flooding will be increased.
• The recent approval of the planning application (14/P/02289) for the Cartbridge Traditional Narrowboat Basin on the River Wey Navigation, (construction works are now underway) already puts pressure on the Tannery Lane junctions with Polseden Lane and Send Road. Therefore the cumulative effect of both developments will result in an increase in the potential for accidents at the road junctions unless substantial highway improvements are made. Also there are over 50 parking spaces within the Cartbridge Basin application site which, together with the associated hardstanding, severely impact on the rural nature of the surrounding Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3308</th>
<th>Respondent: 15301953 / A Smithers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 houses in place of 45 homes is excessive. Tannery Lane is extremely narrow and not wide enough to carry significant increases in traffic. It is already dangerous along the lane and it will impact the open countryside and will unnecessarily erode the Green Belt status of the area. The Marina development has already been approved and the area would be over-development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2685</th>
<th>Respondent: 15303457 / Hannah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, I strongly object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• It will cause extreme congestion at the junction with the A247. Already, at certain times of the day during the working week the whole village is gridlocked. This proposal will only serve to exacerbate the problem
• It will remove greenbelt land which gives the village its 'village feel'
• It will damage open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation and create an eye sore
• It will risk increasing the likelihood of surface water flooding

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1775</th>
<th>Respondent: 15312577 / Freda Ward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have lived on Send Road/Send Barns Lane for the last 40 years and I have very serious concerns about the changes to the local plan that will significantly impact Send and the surrounding villages.

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is **33% more** and too much
- It ignores all the **hundreds of previous objections** made by local people including myself.
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction - there is simply no way this junction can take additional traffic.
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
- The schools in Send Barns Lane are already impacted by traffic and this causes issues at the beginning and end of the school day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3252</th>
<th>Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3534</th>
<th>Respondent: 15320737 / Steven Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>Is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>Is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane - now 60 homes instead of 45

The Village of Send is on Green Belt Land and therefore should only be built on in exceptional circumstances Traffic is already a problem around Tannery Lane and the increase in houses will make it worse.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1479</th>
<th>Respondent: 15325505 / Mark Dominey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this development plan. The 45 proposed houses will add further traffic to an area soon to be overwhelmed. The lane the junction with Send road is not big enough to cope. The planning permission already granted for the development at the Tannery will only see further traffic volume.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1488</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT

Policy A42

Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

This will cause unacceptable traffic levels in Tannery Lane. To the east of the exit the road is narrow (single track in places) with several blind bends exiting into Newark Lane which itself feeds a very narrow and congested junction on to the B2055 in Ripley High Street whilst to the west it feeds onto the A247 a junction with restricted sight lines due to parked cars during the day. It will also add to the additional traffic generated by the proposed marina which is also accessed via Tannery Lane

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2043</th>
<th>Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane,

Policy A42 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

1) The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and excessive
2) It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
3) It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
4) It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
5) It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
6) It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4348  Respondent: 15326657 / Janet Davie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. Specific Sites

Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane (Site No. A42)

- Scale of development: I OBJECT to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will harm the open aspect of the area and views associated with the Wey.
- Scale of development: I OBJECT to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because this area is acknowledged by river users as being part of one of the very few quiet stretches along the Wey Navigation. Any increase in development scale will reduce this ambience.
- Traffic Infrastructure Capacity: I OBJECT to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will create additional traffic movements which existing very narrow roads and the Tannery Lane/A247 intersection cannot safely support.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8242  Respondent: 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42, 45 houses proposed to be built in Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is a country, single access and the staggered cross roads- junction with Send Road is already dangerous, especially due peak times. This will just add to the growing congestion in Send. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the marina, both of which will generate additional traffic (large vehicles for boats etc) The lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Policy A42—change to the Clockbarn in Tannery Lane the increase of the number of houses to 60 is totally excessive and will exacerbateSend which is already at capacity during rush hours. It will impact on the village setting, drainage and local amenities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

4. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate access and traffic volumes. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 apartments further along along Tannery lane which will generate additional heavy traffic. This now additional housing would compound an already dangerous situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because: It ignores all previous objections by residents, and is a 33% increase in homes over and above the original ill conceived plan. Which would exacerbate existing traffic and flooding issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because: It ignores all previous objections by residents, and is a 33% increase in homes over and above the original ill conceived plan. Which would exacerbate existing traffic and flooding issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1642  Respondent: 15342529 / Lesley Peed  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery owing to inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The junction is too dangerous already and will make it much worse.

The plan appears to be ill-though through and wholly irresponsible as it would have the following impact on the local community: -

- Threat to area of natural wildlife and beauty
  - Ongoing threat of total erosion of the Green Belt and the wildlife it encompasses
  - Destruction of a tranquil, peaceful environment
- Disruption during the construction phase
  - Noise from building work
  - Roadworks causing intolerable traffic congestion
  - The construction of trenches along Tannery Lane for additional drainage, electrical services and supply of mains gas (there is no supply of mains gas along Tannery Lane and beyond - residents are instead reliant on oil or LPG).

- Concerns of additional traffic, which would cause gridlock as the narrow lanes are ill-equipped to

  - Tannery Lane - when driving, care is required with pedestrians, where there is no Turning out of Tannery Lane into Send Road can be extremely hazardous as large vans tend to park close to the junction obstructing the view of traffic to the right and left. The junction would benefit from a mini roundabout. This situation is bad enough with existing traffic - it would become intolerable with extra traffic generated.
  - Papercourt Lane would become a rat-run - narrow passing points on blind bends - cars frequently have to pull over or reverse into passing points to allow traffic to pass through. My car was recently damaged by a large SUV which was struggling to get past it.
  - Newark Lane access into Ripley Village is narrow and barely copes with current traffic levels. The road was built in an era where vehicles were much narrower - today wide 4 wheel drive vehicles struggle to get past. There is no opportunity to increase the road width due to the proximity of legacy housing to the narrow pavements. Newark Lane towards Pyrford is narrow and twisty - even now extreme care has to be taken with cyclists and turning right into Warren Lane is currently very hazardous due to a blind bend, on a steep hill. Additional traffic levels would make driving along Newark Lane intolerable.
  - Send Road - even with existing traffic levels extreme traffic congestion was recently encountered towards Old Woking when temporary traffic lights were installed. With higher traffic volumes this gridlock would become intolerable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to policy A42

Tannery Lane is a narrow country lane which already suffers from too much traffic using it. To build 45 new homes on the Clockbarn Nursery site would cause even more traffic congestion in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1670  Respondent: 15343745 / Stephanie Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

I object to the development plan under policy A42. This area, especially the road infrastructure, cannot cope with the further development. The lane and junction with Send Road is simply too small and the added traffic volume will only serve to further congestion the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1677  Respondent: 15344641 / Ann Court  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

   Tannery Lane has as exceptionally narrow and winding road, in places only room for one car and if you meet a lorry there is no room for manoeuvre.

   Also a very hazardous junction coming from Tannery lane to join the Send Road, the sight vision is dreadful with parked cars either side of

   the junction onto the main road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery owing to inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The junction is too dangerous already and will make it much worse.

The plan appears to be ill-thought through and wholly irresponsible as it would have the following impact on the local community: -

- Threat to area of natural wildlife and beauty
- Ongoing threat of total erosion of the Green Belt and the wildlife it encompasses
- Destruction of a tranquil, peaceful environment
  - Disruption during the construction phase
- Noise from building work
- Roadworks causing intolerable traffic congestion
- The construction of trenches along Tannery Lane for additional drainage, electrical services and supply of mains gas (there is no supply of mains gas along Tannery Lane and beyond – residents are instead reliant on oil or LPG).
  - Concerns of additional traffic, which would cause gridlock as the narrow lanes are ill-equipped to cope.
Tannery Lane – when driving, care is required with pedestrians, where there is no pavement. Turning out of Tannery Lane into Send Road can be extremely hazardous as large vans tend to park close to the junction obstructing the view of traffic to the right and left. The junction would benefit from a mini roundabout. This situation is bad enough with existing traffic – it would become intolerable with extra traffic generated.

Papercourt Lane would become a rat-run – narrow passing points on blind bends – cars frequently have to pull over or reverse into passing points to allow traffic to pass through. My car was recently damaged by a large SUV which was struggling to get past it.

Newark Lane access into Ripley Village is narrow and barely copes with current traffic levels. The road was built in an era where vehicles were much narrower – today wide 4 wheel drive vehicles struggle to get past. There is no opportunity to increase the road width due to the proximity of legacy housing to the narrow pavements. Newark Lane towards Pyrford is narrow and twisty – even now extreme care has to be taken with cyclists and turning right into Warren Lane is currently very hazardous due to a blind bend, on a steep hill. Additional traffic levels would make driving along Newark Lane intolerable.

Send Road - even with existing traffic levels extreme traffic congestion was recently encountered towards Old Woking when temporary traffic lights were installed. With higher traffic volumes this gridlock would become intolerable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2907  Respondent: 15350881 / Mark Hewson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 60 homes instead of the previous 45 as this will further contribute to traffic congestion, pollution and loss of green belt in what is a beautiful part of countryside close to the River Wey.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1873  Respondent: 15353089 / Alison Teece  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This area already cannot cope with traffic volumes and the junction with Send Road is already very hazardous. Permission has already been granted for 64 apartments and for building the marina. The infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic and vehicles in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1941  Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford  Agent: Tony Gatford

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This area already cannot cope with traffic volumes and the junction with Send Road is already very hazardous. Permission has already been granted for 64 apartments and for building the marina. The infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic and vehicles in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2691</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356513 / Anthony Gatford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, due to inadequate access and traffic volumes. The junction with Send Road is is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 apartments further along along Tannery lane which will generate additional heavy traffic. This now additional housing would compound an already dangerous situation.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1948</th>
<th>Respondent: 15356833 / Carolyn Gatford</th>
<th>Agent: Tony Gatford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbar4 in Tannery Lane because: It ignores all previous objections by residents, and is a 33% increase in homes over and above the original ill conceived plan. Which would exacerbate existing traffic and flooding issues.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1069  Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 which increases the number of proposed homes from 45 to 60. The impact on traffic and other infrastructure in Tannery Lane and the A427 Junction will be even greater, as will the impact on the Green Belt. This is on top of the impact on the Green Belt of the Marina to be constructed further along Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2031  Respondent: 15366209 / Corinne Singleton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane
1. I object to your proposal to increase the 60 homes in place of the 45 homes, which amounts to an increase of 33%. How can you justify this increase?
2. It ignores the hundreds of objections raised by local people already.
3. It will without doubt have a serious impact on traffic levels and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
4. It will also make the erosion of the green belt in Send Village much worse.
5. It will also make surface water flooding, which is already a problem far worse.
6. It will have an effect on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2163  Respondent: 15370529 / J Wells  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane will cause more traffic problems and a great deal more lorries & cars will be using the existing lane; also the building of a Marina will cause great problems and be very The junctions are already taking a high volume of traffic and are known locally to be dangerous; adding extra vehicles to this including boats on trailers, etc will only serve to exacerbate these issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic and Send Road junction already hazardous for vehicles trying to join main road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane. 45 Houses.

As Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments (Despite strong local objection) in this narrow lane. Further development will only increase traffic in this narrow lane to an already dangerous junction with the A247.
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn as it has inadequate access and the junction with Send Road is already dangerous for vehicles exiting onto the main road. Tannery Lane is a ‘lane’ and is totally inadequate to take large quantities of traffic of any kind. It would also make it extremely hazardous for pedestrians or cyclists. There is already planning permission for 64 houses and a marina which will also generate heavy traffic. The road cannot sustain any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3393</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2367</th>
<th>Respondent: 15389025 / Keith Cogan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clockbarn A42

I objected to the previous proposal to the marina development on Tannery Lane for reasons of traffic etc and the suspicion that further development proposals would follow. More houses here will exacerbate the problem further and I object again to this additional 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

- This is an increase in the scale of development not reduction
- Traffic problems will be worse
- More green belt erosion, against the stunning river way
- Is this not a flood zone?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2409  Respondent: 15390273 / Roderick Hutchison  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

I object to the housing development at Clockbarn Nursery. Once again the proposed development would greatly increase the traffic along a narrow road, particularly given that the Marina development will also lead to increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2413  Respondent: 15390369 / Lewis Thorpe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

In addition to the other proposals, I object to Policy 42, 45 houses proposed to be built in Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is a country, single access and the staggered cross roads- junction with Send Road is already dangerous, especially due peak times. This will just add to the growing congestion in Send. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the marina, both of which will generate additional traffic (large vehicles for boats etc) The lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2427  Respondent: 15391329 / Marian Tarrant  Agent:
I object Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane. 45 Houses.

As Planning permission has already been granted for development of a marina and 64 apartments (Despite strong local objection) in this narrow lane. Further development will only increase traffic in this narrow lane to an already dangerous junction with the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2434  Respondent: 15391361 / Paul Thorpe  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition to the other proposals, I object to Policy A42,45 houses proposed to be built in Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is a country, single access and the staggered cross roads- junction with Send Road is already dangerous, especially due peak times. This will just add to the growing congestion in Send. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the marina, both of which will generate additional traffic (large vehicles for boats etc) The lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2442  Respondent: 15391809 / Dan Haskins  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is narrow, with poor access, and the junction with the A247 is already dangerous. Another 45 residences will create chaos The apartments proposed for further along this lane, where I enjoy walking and running, alongside many others, simply cannot be adequately accessed via the one track lane. Widening this lane will destroy footpaths and farmland. More concrete, less nature. Another erosion of the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1544  Respondent: 15397793 / Sheila Collins  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2461  Respondent: 15398593 / Kirsten Collins  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A42

I object to the inclusion of this site within the local plan. Development of this site will be used to justify future development plans in the area that will have a significant impact on the semi-rural location that the plans specifies; while careful design can mitigate the immediate impact, I believe that it would have significant impact on the area in the longer-term. Access to the site will be via Tannery Lane that will experience a greater volume of traffic in the near future following the approval of plans for 64 apartments at the tannery and building of the Marina and any further development at Clockbarn nursery would further exacerbate this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2517  Respondent: 15400897 / Alison Parkinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - this is already a dangerous and overloaded road as it is!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1248  Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7523  Respondent: 15419713 / Russell Woods  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty and with increased traffic this will make it very dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7577  Respondent: 15421633 / Julia Cogan  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for building 45 houses at Clockbarn. It feels as if comments made by residents of Send are simply ignored from one planning proposal to the next. I sat through the planning meeting where planning permission was granted for a marina on Tannery Lane. Even though the problems of vehicle access along Tannery lane and at its exits – a narrow windy lane with stretches of single passing, with an extremely narrow and windy residential stretch, if traffic continues onto Papercourt Lane, and a tricky junction onto the A247 in Send where visibility to turn out onto the main road is very tricky and hazardous – were raised by many, those who voted to grant permission in no way addressed those issues –the permission to develop the Green belt seemed to be granted on the basis that there were ‘special circumstances’ thereby making it acceptable. The requirements attached to the permission for the marina only appear to address the issues of a pathway through to Wharf Lane and the widening of a 200m stretch towards Send Road. This will not be adequate to eradicate traffic problems from this development and will certainly not support further development. I have never understood what the special circumstances are that would justify introducing hazardous traffic levels to our area and there was the additional concern, at the time, that granting of this permission would lead to further applications in this area, Tannery Lane cannot take any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7597  Respondent: 15423073 / Joanna McNamara  Agent:
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Fourthly, I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is a narrow and twisty lane which at times can be hazardous. Building more houses down here will increase the chance of accidents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/2802  Respondent: 15426113 / Sarah Ross  Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery as there is no road infrastructure to support these additional houses and existing junctions will be made even more hazardous than they already are.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/2828  Respondent: 15426849 / Ian Shaw  Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

1.

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. The added traffic will bring congestion and hazards to an already busy and narrow country lane. The Business Park on Tannery Lane is already working at capacity so it is impossible to imagine how the traffic would be managed at the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road. A cursory glance demonstrates how difficult that junction is to navigate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/2849  Respondent: 15427329 / Christina Shaw  Agent: |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. The added traffic will bring congestion and hazards to an already busy and narrow country lane. The Business Park on Tannery Lane is already working at capacity so it is impossible to imagine how the traffic would be managed at the junction of Tannery Lane and Send Road. A cursory glance demonstrates how difficult that junction is to navigate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2868  Respondent: 15427937 / Elizabeth Lawes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object;

To the building of Houses at Clockbarn Nursery as the access is so poor.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3820  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because the proposed housing has increased by 33% from 45 to 60 homes on a road with very restricted access: being effectively single lane in places. Tannery Lane is already used by many motorists as a cut through and is particularly dangerous in winter, as there are no street lights and no restriction on speed. There have already been hundreds of objections by Send residents to the inevitable increase in traffic on this road. This is also an area prone to serious surface water flooding, making it unsuitable for increased housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2719  Respondent: 15433153 / Helen Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specifically, I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• It will cause extreme congestion at the junction with the A247. Already, at certain times of the day during the working week the whole village is gridlocked. This proposal will only serve to exacerbate the problem
• It will remove greenbelt land which gives the village its 'village feel'
• It will damage open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation and create an eye sore
• It will risk increasing the likelihood of surface water flooding

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Specifically, I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• It will cause extreme congestion at the junction with the A247. Already, at certain times of the day during the working week the whole village is gridlocked. This proposal will only serve to exacerbate the problem
• It will remove greenbelt land which gives the village its 'village feel'
• It will damage open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation and create an eye sore
• It will risk increasing the likelihood of surface water flooding

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2996  Respondent: 15433473 / Kay Webb  Agent:

I OBJECT to Policy A42 (building 45 houses at Clockbarn) because the roads are completely inadequate for the increase in traffic volume this will cause. Tannery Lane is a very narrow, windy, country road which has a hazardous junction for emerging traffic with Send Road. There is already planning permission for 64 houses and a new Marina which is going to generate too much heavy traffic as it is!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/2624  Respondent: 15433473 / Kay Webb  Agent:

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn, Tannery Lane. The increase in the number of homes from 45 to 60 is too much. Tannery Lane is a narrow rural road which is heavily congested already and has access and traffic problems at the junction with the A247. There are also concerns about existing surface water flooding worsening

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/1562  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3091 Respondent: 15437089 / Jamie Manester Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane - I know and have driven this lane on numerous occasions and object to this proposal. It is ludicrous given that you can only fit one car down the lane and it is very narrow! The roads just do not support the level of increased traffic, the proposal will be hazardous to the public and environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4334 Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I object to site allocation A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send as it is totally wrong to increase the number of planned homes from 45 to 60 when the total number of homes in the borough during the period of the plan has been calculated as 1,434 lower than the 2016 draft Local Plan. There is therefore no justification for an increase on this site.

7. I object to Site Allocation A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, as the delivery of all site allocations is contingent upon the delivery of new physical infrastructure (see Foreword extract above) whilst the plan does not include any Utility Infrastructure at all for A42: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 2 Utilities pages 320- 325, which contains NOTHING in respect of A42 in respect of Electricity and Gas distribution and supply; Water supply; Wastewater connections and treatment; Flood risk reduction : surface water mitigation measures, so sufficient physical infrastructure for utilities is NOT planned for.

8. I object to Site Allocation A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, as the delivery of all site allocations is contingent upon the delivery of new physical infrastructure (see Foreword extract above) whilst the plan does not include any Transport Infrastructure at all: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 1 Transport pages 310-316, which contains nothing specific to A42, just a
vaguely worded LRN 20 Send Road/Send Barnes Lane (Send) traffic management and environmental improvement scheme which will do nothing to overcome the increased congestion in the narrow Tannery Lane arising from 60 new homes being built, an increase of 15 from 2016.

9. I object to Site Allocation A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send as the delivery of all site allocations is contingent upon the delivery of new green infrastructure (see Foreword extract above) whilst the plan does not include any Green Infrastructure at all: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 3 Green Infrastructure pages 325-328, which contains NOTHING in respect of Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane in respect of Green Infrastructure. To the contrary, the existing Green Infrastructure will be significantly reduced by the building of 60 new homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3154  Respondent: 15440161 / Linda Daniell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery with the building of 45 houses as Tannery Lane is extremely narrow and is already a difficult road from which to join Send Road. As there are already plans for a Marina and new apartments on that lane, I consider that this will create undue heavy traffic and dangerous driving conditions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3169  Respondent: 15440641 / Ben Lawrence  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because as you can see from my address, tannery lane is directly opposite Sandy Lane which at the moment is a complete traffic jam already, let alone another 45 plus cars joining this crossroads. I myself drive back home through tannery lane after picking my son up from nursery and find it very dangerous trying to drive across the road with all the park cars, if you think my son's life isn't important then so be it but your going to put people's lives in danger with this proposal. The road is so inadequate to accommodate this.

I request my comments are shown to the Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3179  Respondent: 15440993 / Rebecca Woods  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty and with increased traffic this will make it very dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3953  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3236  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate heavy traffic. The lane cannot take anymore. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/315  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because

1. It increases to 60 homes from 45.
2. It ignores the thousands of previous objections previously made by local people.
3. Traffic problems concerning Tannery Lane will worsen considerably.
4. Further contempt for the Green Belt and a history going back to Roman times.
5. Ridiculous promotion of building on an area that is frequently flooded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3260  Respondent: 15443265 / C Knaggs  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the work on Clockbarn nursery. Too much congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3293  Respondent: 15446561 / Peter Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Some of the planning papers presented to the public were written by a company who had obviously never visited the site. Their descriptions of the roads and access were figments of their imagination as much of Tannery lane is too narrow for two cars to pass.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/318  Respondent: 15446561 / Peter Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because
1. It increases to 60 homes from 45.
2. It ignores the thousands of previous objections previously made by local people.
3. Traffic problems concerning Tannery Lane will worsen considerably.
4. Further contempt for the Green Belt and a history going back to Roman times.
5. Ridiculous promotion of building on an area that is frequently flooded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/680  Respondent: 15446689 / James Eric Barr  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the Policy A42 change at Tannery Lane because increasing the number of homes from 45 to 60 will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction, it is an erosion of the Green Belt and will impact open countryside views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3105  Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries because of inadequate access and traffic volumes (please see below).

The increase in homes from 45 to 60 seems like far too much for the area and it ignores all the previous objections which have been made by local people in the village.

The traffic at the Tannery Lane junction and the main road (A247) is already bad as this is a difficult junction to exit - the proposals can only make matters far worse.

This area is subject to flooding - there is a flood plain nearby. The proposal does not contain good plans for removal of surface water.

This village benefits from the Wey Navigation Canal and its open countryside is an asset. So many houses will mar the views which attract tourism on the canal to the area.

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. The junction with Send road is already dangerous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina both of which will generate additional heavy traffic.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3565</th>
<th>Respondent: 15454977 / Graham Hook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Legally Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the development of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery, as Tannery Lane is narrow and unsuitable for any additional amount of traffic, the junction onto Send road is already difficult, hazardous and dangerous at times. This on top of the existing granted planning permission would be a very poor decision to allow.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3713</th>
<th>Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Legally Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this proposal.

This rural country lane, Tannery Lane, has already had permission granted for the building of a marina and 64 apartments. These will cause a huge increase in traffic using this very narrow lane and also an increase in the traffic exiting the lane onto Send Road (A247).

Send Road is already extremely busy and frequently at a standstill because of the amount of traffic travelling between the A3, Woking, Guildford and other villages in the borough. Residents living along Send Road are either inhaling traffic fumes because of the traffic jams or in danger trying to cross this busy road. On many occasions Send residents have requested traffic calming measures and a pedestrian crossing but have only been given 3 traffic islands which are constantly being damaged.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3755</th>
<th>Respondent: 15459297 / Mark Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Legally Compliant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herewith my objections to this dreadful Guildford Plan.
I want these objections to be passed on to the Government Inspector.

Will you please confirm that you have received this email and that my objections are being passed on to the Inspector.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.

There is inadequate access and high local traffic volume.

Planning permission has been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina. This will generate additional heavy traffic. By adding another 45 houses, this will greatly add to the traffic already there it will be even more chaotic. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous for vehicles joining the Main Road, this proposal will make it even worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3808  **Respondent:** 15461217 / S. Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery

Tannery Lane is extremely narrow, with stretches of twisty single lane with passing places. The junction with Send Road is hazardous and cases delay to vehicles joining Send Road.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1940  **Respondent:** 15461217 / S. Gilby  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the change to Policy A42, Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane. because it hugely increases house numbers, it will cause huge traffic problems, and it once again ignores the many previous objections made by concerned local people.

Guildford Borough Council are failing to defend the Green Belt, and failing to take note of the concerns of local people.

I call on GBC to listen to the concerns local residents are raising, act on their objections, and accordingly amend the Local Plan 2017.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1578  **Respondent:** 15461761 / K.J. Pullen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4000</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I note that the changes you have made actually increase the number of homes from 45 to 60, a 33% rise which is too much. This ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by people. I cannot understand why you have done this. The access and traffic problems that already exist in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction will get worse. Erosion of the Green Belt in our village will become worse with the surface water flooding, which is already a serious problem. The countryside views from the River Wey Navigation that are enjoyed by so many will be spoiled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3657</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because an increase to 60 homes is just too big for this area it will make surface water flooding which is already bad in this area even worse and will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4003</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468833 / Zoe Kollov</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I utterly object to building 45 houses at Cockbarn nursery. There will be inadequate access and vastly increased traffic volumes, without mentioning the likely increased volumes of traffic for Woking station which already boasts some of the most busy rush hour services in the country (this applies to all the proposed development). The junction with send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )
- is Sound? ( )
- is Legally Compliant? ( )
road is already very dangerous for cars and lorries trying to join the main road. This will be on top of the previous planning permission granted at the tannery and the marina which will themselves greatly increase traffic volumes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4020  Respondent: 15468993 / Nicholas Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is already a dangerous road which is very narrow. Coupled with planning for the marina and appartments this road will be overloaded and the junction with Send Road made even more hazardous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1402  Respondent: 15468993 / Nicholas Brown  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

a) Access is already poor with Tannery Lane being far too narrow to accomodate the proposed increase in housing. Access onto Send Road (A247)is dangerous with vehicles often parked on the kerbs adjacent to the junction. The other direction along Tannery Lane is single track in places. Any increase in car numbers is going to exacerbate these problems.

b) A proposed increase of 33% is far too much (45 homes was already pushing the limits)

c) This proposal seems to ignore all previous local objections - why is this so?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4036  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to building 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery. Tannery Lane is a small, winding road which is prone to flooding in bad weather. It is hazardous and dangerous especially at the junction with Send Road. This makes it an unsuitable location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2930  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 Clockburn nursery site. Tannery Lane, Send
I object to the increase of 15 houses (60 instead of the previous 45).
  a) The site is prone to surface flooding.
  b) The beautiful countryside of the Wey Navigation flora and fauna will be permanently damaged,
  c) increase in traffic in Tannery Lane, a lovely narrow country lane, and particularly at the junction with the A247 which will become a dangerous area opposite The children's playing field.
  d) There is no justification for the increase, ignoring hundreds of previous objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4080  Respondent: 15471489 / P Gilby  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery.
This is inadequate access to Tannery Lane which is narrow and has a dangerous junction with the busy A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4089  Respondent: 15472833 / Lorraine Ozanne  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery- the lane cannot take any more traffic and there is inadequate access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4128  Respondent: 15473729 / Barrie and Jenny Kelly  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the planned development at clock barn nursery policy a42. There is insufficient infrastructure in this area. Specifically the road system. Send road cannot handle any more traffic. It is a major hazard and dangerous with the park opposite full of kids. Schools and doctors would appear to be also full to capacity. Use BROWN field sites and not greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4190  Respondent: 15476737 / R G Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Traffic along Send Road is heavy and will be made worse when changes are made in accordance with the planning consents for expansion of Vision Engineering premises in Send Road, the Marina in Tannery Lane and the Tannery site additions. It is not acceptable that large areas should be removed from the Green Belt and accepted for development when these three planning consents, when implemented, will have a major affect on traffic in the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/321  Respondent: 15477729 / Julia Hoar  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockburn in Tannery Lane because

1. It increases to 60 homes from 45.
2. It ignores the thousands of previous objections previously made by loclal people.
3. Traffic problems concerning Tannery Lane will worsen considerably.
4. Further contempt for the Green Belt and a history going back to Roman times.
5. Ridiculous promotion of building on an area that is frequently flooded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1827  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/952  Respondent: 15485601 / Tim Jewers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SITE A42 TANNERY LANE, SEND

The increase from 45 to 60 new homes. This may seem small but with poor public transport in the area every home will be reliant on cars.

I strongly object to this thoughtless development in the NE of the borough. The subsequent increase in traffic, pollution and overcrowding is a recipe for traffic disaster and poor air quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2155  Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Herewith my objections to this terrible Guildford Plan. Will you please pass these objections to the Government Inspector. Will you please confirm that you have received this email and that my objections are being passed on to the Inspector.

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. There is inadequate access and high local traffic volume. Planning permission has been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina. This will generate additional heavy traffic. By adding another 45 houses, this will greatly add to the traffic already there it will be even more gridlocked. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous for vehicles joining the Main Road, this proposal will make it far more dangerous.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to CLOCKBARN NURSERY TANNERY LANE POLICY A42 because: Increasing the homes from 60 instead of 45 is an increase of 33% is far too many.
Why have all the previous objections been ignored and then you have added to the number of houses?

The Junction of Tannery Lane and the A247 are at gridlock, lots of times each day at present, and coming out from this junction is VERY DANGEROUS.

Adding any houses to Tannery Lane would add to the danger but 60 houses with say another 120 vehicles as well as delivery vans will give constant gridlock, and accidents.

It will add to the existing surface water flooding.

As a boat user on the River Wey Navigation it will detract from the lovely views from this Canal.

It will further erode our precious Green Belt, which the Government is Committed to keep.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockburn Nursery.

The inadequacy of Tannery Lane and the nearby roads to cope with the additional traffic caused by the unwanted development of 64 apartments and a marina must not be compounded by adding even more traffic if the Clockburn Nursery development is granted. This over-development must not be allowed to happen if we are to avoid appalling traffic destroying the enjoyment of this quiet village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3640  Respondent: 15505377 / Simon Wright  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane due to the following points:

The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is single track for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical with 45 homes, so an increase of 33% is just ridiculous.

Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with traffic for 45 extra homes, so an increase is not going to work.

Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. The traffic for this development has not yet been added to the current traffic situation.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane, so an increase in homes just exacerbates the problem.

This change ignores hundreds of previous objections. These have been made by people who live locally, the people who know the area best, they should be listened to, not pushed to one side.

Surface water flooding will be increased with the original number of homes, additional homes will make the situation worse still.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5548  Respondent: 15507649 / Nick Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 Clockburn Nursery. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. The site has very restricted access along Tannery
Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to policy A42 changes at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because: There is no need for housing on this site, the local plan housing target is incorrect. The figures quoted way exceed the local need, the local requirements are for social housing and not large executive boxes as favoured by developers to maximize profits. The revised proposal to increase the development by 33% makes a mockery of THE GREEN BELT. The site is part of the permanent GREEN BELT at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. Any development will create URBAN SPRAWL along the Wey Navigation and have a very negative effect on this asset of Guildford Borough. The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery - there is already a high volume of traffic and the roads cannot take any further traffic. The roads are particularly windy and very dangerous to all road users. By building additional properties this will compound the existing issues with dire consequences.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5790  Respondent: 15574497 / Ann Murray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. Tannery Lane is a very narrow and twisty road. The junction with Send Road is hazardous and it is difficult to join the Send Road. I understand that planning permission has already been given for some apartments at the Tannery and also for the building of the Marina. This will all generate heavy traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1700  Respondent: 15574497 / Ann Murray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane because there is an increase from 45 homes to 60. Despite hundreds of previous objections made by local people, concerned about access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane, surface water flooding and erosion of the Green Belt the number of houses planned has been increased. The idea of a planning consultation is that the Council listens to the concerns of local people and alters it plans to take account of these objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5811  Respondent: 15575137 / Charlotte Procter  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to 45 more houses being built at Clockbarn Nursery because I do not believe that there will be adequate access and traffic volume will be increased. This will be disastrous as traffic and delays is already a problem in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5851  Respondent: 15575617 / Pete Killingley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the plans for 45 houses to be built at Clockbarn Nursery, for similar reasons to those already given. The increased amount of traffic, the narrow roads, and so on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5859  Respondent: 15575713 / Sophie Killingley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plans for 45 houses to be built at Clockbarn Nursery, for similar reasons to those already given. The increased amount of traffic, the narrow roads, and so on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6034  Respondent: 15582817 / Karsten Kollov  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I utterly object to building 45 houses at Cockbarn nursery. There will be inadequate access and vastly increased traffic volumes, without mentioning the likely increased volumes of traffic for Woking station which already boasts some of the most busy rush hour services in the country (this applies to all the proposed development). The junction with send road is already very dangerous for cars and lorries trying to join the main road. This will be on top of the previous planning permission granted at the tannery and the marina which will themselves greatly increase traffic volumes

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2959  Respondent: 15583553 / Malcolm Murray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane

because the proposed increase to 60 houses is pushing the limit for how the local infrastructure can cope in particular the narrowness of Tannery Lane for which there is probably no resolution without demolishing existing properties and also the very poor sightlines on the junction with the A247.

When the original proposals were published I did not object as the village does need extra houses but this is typical council thinking that if few people object then they can pile even more houses on to the plan and get away with it.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/380  Respondent: 15583777 / Adam Lee  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 (Cockburn Nursery) due to the increase of homes from 45 to 60 homes - a 33% increase.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6097  Respondent: 15584065 / Amy Gervasio  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the houses proposed at Clockbarn Nursery because the lane there just will not cope with that sort of traffic! It is too narrow and twisty. The junction with the main road through Send is already overloaded and cannot take the added amount of traffic resulting from possibly an extra 90 to 100 cars generated by 45 houses!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6103  Respondent: 15584097 / George Gervasio  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object specifically to the proposed Clockbarn Nursery development in Send. Tannery Lane is not wide enough or straight enough to allow the amount of traffic generated by 45 houses. The junction of Tannery Lane, Sandy Lane with Send Road is a nightmare now. This amount of development will make it impossible and Tannery Lane cannot be widened at this junction as there is housing on either side.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6155  Respondent: 15585249 / Joe Eke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to the proposed development Clockbarn Nursery (policy A42) due to the impact that the additional traffic will have on small local roads. Send Road is already frequently blocked by HGVs trying to turn into Tannery Lane; this can only be made worse by additional traffic using the same road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4040  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4026  Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3454  Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.
Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane

I object to the development proposal for 45 houses, again because of inadequate access and volume of traffic. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and has a number of bends making additional traffic an obvious non starter. It is already hazardous for vehicles attempting to join the main Send Road. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and building a Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic.

In particular I have issues with Guildford’s plans for the following developments as they do not show consideration for their surroundings, the impact the influx of large numbers of people will have on village life or the roads that will receive increased traffic flow.

Clockburn Nursery, Tannery Lane (45 houses) covers an area where there is already a marina and 64 apartments planned. Tannery lane is a single track road that already takes far too much traffic. The quality of the road is poor and the edges non-existent and walking along these roads impossible. It emerges at Send Road at a cross roads that is already horrendous to navigate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
11. I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) 
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6509  Respondent: 15593665 / Thomas Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take and more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building a marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more traffic. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3122  Respondent: 15593665 / Thomas Cope  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse

• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6535  Respondent: 15595105 / James Beauchamp  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Page 253 of 327  Document page number 474
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane as the addition of more houses (33%) will cause more traffic and access problems in the narrow Tannery Lane. The junction with Send Road is already very dangerous and the proposed additional traffic will only make this worse. It will ruin the countryside view in this area near the River Wey and further erode the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6590</th>
<th>Respondent: 15596129 / Kim Beauchamp</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6624</th>
<th>Respondent: 15596961 / Peter Meadows</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We strongly object to the plan to erect 45 new houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to the impact of the increased level of traffic. Tannery Lane is a regular route for us and we constantly feel to be at risk to our safety due to the narrow width, winding road and volume of traffic. Anything that adds to this is not acceptable and risks injury to an even greater extent than now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7251</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602529 / Darren Lambert</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging.
into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3838  Respondent: 15604161 / Simon Greener  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- Yet again you are ignoring the clear concerns of local people. Why?

- Tannery lane is not appropriate for the development you seem determined to allow. Why don’t you come and have a look at the narrow nature of the lane (it is a lane) that is wholly unsuitable for the amount of additional traffic that would be generated.

- There is a 33% increase in homes. Why? This ignores the wishes of local people and exacerbates the above problems.

- The permanence of the open River Way countryside will be permanently lost. Quite clearly that is counter to the key tenets of the NPPF. There are no exceptional circumstances.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6872  Respondent: 15609057 / Julian Long  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been granted for 64 appartments at the Tannery and for building the Marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane simply cannot take any more. The junction is already too dangerous and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7649  Respondent: 15609185 / Sophocles Alexiou  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery. This is a ridiculous idea. Tannery lane is a narrow and bendy road joining Send Road at a very difficult and potentially dangerous junction. The traffic in Send is already heavily congested and further traffic emerging from Tannery Lane will only make this worse. Traffic improvements at the junction will not help, as the congestion is the result of bottlenecks at both the Burnt Common and Old Woking roundabouts. The future traffic has already been exacerbated by planning permission for 64 apartments and a marina further down Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2699  Respondent: 15632289 / Claire Belton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 - to the original 45 homes and the increase to 60 homes, on the basis that it is Green-belt and flood-zone land; and that local roads including Tannery Lane and the A247 are narrow and already severely congested. There is a clear agenda to open up this area to development, with a view to increasing these numbers further in the future.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7265  Respondent: 15637633 / Scott Kent  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockharn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7352  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 45 houses at Clockharn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7605  Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A42 CLOCKBARN NURSERY

I object to policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery. There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The site is part of the permanent Green Belt at Send and should remain undeveloped in order to preserve the amenity of the surrounding area. The site has very restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwisely given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psl172/1851  Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

The proposed allocation for 45 homes in the previous draft plan on green belt land was objected to & I object again to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is unsuitable for the quantity of traffic which would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7648  Respondent: 15658497 / Philip Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery because of the inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and twisty to take and more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles trying to join the main road. Planning permission has previously been granted for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building a marina, both of which will generate additional heavy traffic. The lane cannot take any more traffic. The junction is too dangerous already and will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Site A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send

The Parish is very concerned that additional development will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion in the village. The cumulative impact of proposed allocation A44, Send Business Centre and unimplemented planning permission 14/P/02289 for a new marina to the north of Tannery Lane could introduce significant levels of new traffic to the surrounding streets.

Tannery Lane is narrow, making it very difficult for vehicles to pass along the entire length, especially for larger commercial vehicles. This often results in vehicles needing to reverse to find a suitable passing place. Currently short-term parking occurs along Tannery Lane and Send Road, which can lead to reductions in visibility for drivers emerging from the side road. Tannery Lane narrows towards the northern end and the 400m stretch before the junction with Polesden Lane is c.2.75m wide. The road cannot be widened due to the adjacent nature reserve.
Tannery Lane also provides poor pedestrian access. There is a short section of pavement on the southern side of the lane, running approximately 100m north east of Send Road. The remainder of Tannery Lane has no provision for pedestrians, with few opportunities for improvement due to the narrow carriageway.

Although Environment Agency flood maps include the site in flood zone 1, the land currently floods, despite recent improvements to drainage. Send Parish therefore urge the Council to re-consider this proposed allocation in light of traffic and flooding issues.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Future Planning & Development provide planning advice to our client Send Surrey Ltd in respect of their site Land Heath Drive Send, Woking, Surrey, GU23 7EP (‘the site’).

This Statement has been prepared in response to the Guildford Borough Council Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation (Regulation 19) which ends on 18 July 2015.

The 2.51ha site is privately owned by Send Surrey Ltd. The site is proposed to be allocated as Open Space in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Our client has previously made representations to promote the site for housing through the Local Plan process.

Section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires that local plans must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in accordance with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Send Surrey Ltd. does not consider that the draft Local Plan submitted by Guildford Borough Council meets the definition of “sound” set of in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

The objections focus on two specific policy areas with regards to the soundness of the plan: open space and housing delivery. Both of these policy areas are pertinent to our clients’ interests in developing the site for housing, however the representations are submitted without prejudice to the development aspirations of Send Surrey Ltd.

The remainder of this statement is set out as follows:
a. The background to the site
b. The allocation of the site in the Local Plan
c. Assessment of the housing policies
d. Assessment of the open space polices
e. Assessment of the soundness of the plan
f. Proposed modifications to the plan

**Background**

**Site Description**

The 2.51ha site is located at Land Heath Drive Send, Woking, Surrey GU23 7EP in the north-western corner of the village of Send. The site is privately owned and currently has no formal use.

The site is bound by the Wey Navigation Canal to the north and west. To the south and east the site is bound by residential development which effectively forms the northern edge of the built-up part of the village.

The site is privately owned with no legal rights of way across the site. The site does not have any formal footpaths within it, however, at present, it is not enclosed.

The site is undeveloped and includes a number of mature trees with the denser tree coverage around the northern and western boundaries and open space within the centre of the site.

The site is covered by a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The TPO was confirmed on 9 September 1997. The Emergency TPO was made following the felling of a number of trees undertaken by a previous owner of the site. The TPO was justified upon the basis that the group of trees provided high amenity value; particularly from the Wey Navigation.

The site is in a sustainable location with easy access to services provided within the village of send and public transport links to the facilities and services provided within neighbouring villages and towns. The site is not at risk of flooding and is located within Flood Zone 1.

**Ownership and Opportunity of Delivery of Housing**
The site is owned by a single company called Send Surrey Ltd (registered number 10173245). The company intends to develop the site for housing. The site is available, viable and deliverable for housing in the short-term (0 – 5 years).

Taking account of existing constraints and access, the site could deliver in the region of 30 – 40 units. The existing tree coverage and edge of settlement location encourages a low density development of around 25 dwellings per hectare over the developable part of the site which is around 1.5ha. The protected 1ha of land will ensure that the northern and western boundary of the site would retain its tree lined perimeter; this is the part of the site which contributes to the site’s visual amenity value. An indicative layout for 32 units is provided in Appendix 1.

Any residential development will provide 40% affordable housing in line with policy. The housing mix will respond to local needs and also the physical constraints of the site.

2.10 The development of the site provides an opportunity for a natural extension to the built-up part of the village whilst retaining the key features of amenity and providing public access through the site to enable it to function as open space.

Planning Background

2.11 The site was submitted to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2014. The site was identified (reference number 052) as a potential low density site for 16 units within a timeframe of 11 to 15 years. The low density and delayed timeframe proposed by the Council was due to its perceived uncertainty of deliverability due to the multiple ownership of the site at the time. The SHLAA extract is given in Appendix 2.

2.12 The Draft Local Plan was published for consultation in June 2014 (Regulation 18).

The Draft Local Plan amended the settlement boundary to include the site. It also proposed to inset the site from the Green Belt. The Draft Local Plan Proposals Map inset for Send is given in Appendix 3.

2.13 The site was however discounted for housing in the Land Availability Assessment (May 2016) due to suitability concerns over protected open space, the TPO covering the site and the impact on the Corridor of the River Wey.

Legislative Framework and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Plan-making Policies

Paragraph 182 of the NPPF provides guidance on the Examination of Local Plans. It states “The Local Plan will be examined by the Planning Inspectorate whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is “sound” – namely that it is:

- Positively prepared – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
- Consistent with national policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

Paragraph 167 relates to the appropriate use of the evidence base in the plan making process. It states “Wherever possible the local planning authority should consider how the preparation of any assessment will contribute to the plan’s evidence base. The process should be started early in the plan-making process and key stakeholders should be consulted in identifying the issues that the assessment must cover”

Open Space Policies

Open Space is defined in the NPPF as:
“All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity”

Paragraph 72 of the NPPF states “Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. The assessments should identify specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses of open space, sports and recreational facilities in the local area. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sports and recreational provision is required”

Paragraph 74 of the NPPF states “Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

• an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
• the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
• the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.”

Housing Policies

Housing delivery is at the heart of the NPPF. Paragraph 17 sets out the overarching core planning principles to underpin the plan making and decision taking process, one of which is to objectively identify the need for housing (and other development) and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development. Paragraph 47 relates specifically to housing supply and states “To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

• use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period;
• identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;
• identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15;
• for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target; and
• set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances

The Allocation of the Site

The allocation of the site is set out on the Proposed Submission Local Plan Proposal Map, extract below: <see attachments>

The site is designated as Open Space (pink line) and Conservation Area (brown line). The site, and the wider village, have been inset from the from the Green Belt boundary (green dashed line). There is no proposed settlement boundary to the village.

Send is a Rural Local Centre in accordance with the Hierarchy of Retail and Service Centres. The function of such centres is to provide for everyday retail and service needs for the local population of that immediate area with larger ones also including a number of more specialist comparison shops
The Proposed Submission Local Plan proposes to allocate the site as open space under Policy I4 - Green and Blue Infrastructure.

Policy I4 states “Open space (encompassing all open space within urban areas, land designated as Open Space on the Policies Map and all land and water that provides opportunities for recreation and sport) will be protected from development in accordance with the NPPF”

The preamble to the policy clarifies the role that open space plays “Public open space is particularly important due to the positive contribution it makes to the character of our settlements, our health and social interaction, and forms the backbone of the green infrastructure network in our settlements. Therefore it is considered that cumulatively these spaces form a valued asset of strategic importance that should be protected as a strategic priority”

Strategic Policy S2 sets out the growth in the borough over the plan period. With specific regards to housing, the policy states “During the plan period (2013-33), we will make provision for 13,860 new homes… The delivery of homes is expected to increase over the plan period, reflective of timescales associated with the delivery of strategic sites and infrastructure. The housing target each year is as set out below, however, this is not a ceiling, and earlier delivery of allocated sites will be supported where appropriate, subject to infrastructure provision”

The policy sets out its annual housing targets over the plan period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Housing Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018/19</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/20</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/23</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/25</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/26</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026/27</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027/28</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028/29</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029/30</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030/31</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031/32</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032/33</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Open Space Policy Assessment**

The site is allocated as Open Space under policy IC4 in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The evidence base prepared in support of the policy is the Guildford Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment 2016 – 2033 (June 2016) in addition to the Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value (May 2016). Together, the assessments are
the primary evidence base documents produced in support of the open space policy – Policy I4 – in the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

The Open Space Sport & Recreation Assessment identifies land of public value across the borough. The assessment identifies that the site is “Accessible Natural Green Space” (brown shading on extract below). This housing typology is incorrect; this land does not meet the criteria by virtue of the fact that it is privately owned.

The Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value is an evidence base document produced in support of the open space policy IC4.

The assessment sets out a methodology to score various sites’ amenity value. The methodology assesses sites on a number of criteria as set out in Table 1 (page 8). The criteria includes: aesthetic value, access to the site, access to community facilities; access within the site; biodiversity; links to other green infrastructure; derelict or damaged land and overall amenity value.

The specific scores in relation to the above criteria are not given in the report; however the assessor’s comments in relation to the site are given as follows “Access to the site off a cul-de-sac and along an informal footpath running through the trees, sycamore dominated semi-mature trees with nice understory, some very mature oak and chestnut trees. View in and out of site”

The site came out with an amenity value score of ‘high’, this in turn led to the allocation of the site as Open Space on the Proposed Submission Proposal Map in accordance with the allocation methodology.

This assessment is however wrongly informed and therefore the evidence base is flawed in respect of this site.

**Housing Delivery Policy Assessment**

Strategic policy S2 seeks to deliver 13,860 units over the plan period. The annual housing targets set out in the policy have been adjusted to provide more units towards the later stages of the plan period.

The bulk of the housing is to be delivered by development in the Guildford urban area and a number of strategic sites at Gosden Hill Farm and Blackwell Farm (3,940 units, Policies A25 and A26) and the Former Wisley Airfield (2,100 units, Policy A35). These sites have been earmarked for delivery in 1-15 year period in Table 1 of the Local Plan (page 26). The Housing Topic Paper highlights that the early years of the plan are more dependent on a number of smaller sites, than a lesser number of larger sites.

**Soundness of the Plan**

Open Space

Open space is defined in the NPPF as land of public value which provides opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.

The land allocated for open space is privately owned land with no access to the public and therefore does not provide for any sport or recreation opportunity. It is however acknowledged that, to a degree, there is some amenity value; however, this alone is not sufficient to justify the site’s allocation for open space.

Paragraph 72 of the NPPF requires that policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessment of the needs for open space identifying specific needs and quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses.

The site has been erroneously identified as being public land. This has led to it being identified as suitable for assessment as open space. Upon this basis, the allocation of the site is not sound.

It is acknowledged that the site holds some amenity value. The amenity value relates to the visual appreciation of the trees lining the River Wey viewed from the north of the village; this is the only vantage point from which the trees can be fully viewed.
Although there is some amenity value, the amenity value is the only benefit the site has with regards to the recognised function of “open space” as set out in the NPPF. It has no recreational or sporting value. Furthermore, there is no prerequisite for open space to be of amenity value, the primary function is for sport and recreation, in some instance it “can act as a visual amenity”.

The amenity value of the site has been recognised through the Tree Preservation Order for the site. It is our view that the TPO is sufficient to protect the amenity value of the site. The allocation of the site for open space is therefore unnecessary and unduly restrictive. This is unsound in accordance with the need for plan to be justified based on proportionate evidence.

It is also important to highlight that the village is surrounded by Green Belt; this is land which is designated principally for its amenity value. The proposed removal of the site from Green Belt in the current plan and allocation for open space (adjoining Green Belt) is somewhat perplexing because it does not meet with the objective of allocating open space for amenity value. Open space is often allocated to provide relief from built form where it can be appreciated and is of its highest public value.

The amenity value of the site is limited due to it adjoining the Green Belt and being outside of the built-up part of the village. In addition, the site’s location on the edge of the village results in there being little distinction between amenity value of the site and the amenity value of the surrounding Green Belt. If, on the contrary, the site was accessible open space in the middle of the village distinguishable from the built form of the village, e.g. a village green, then an open space allocation would be warranted. We believe that the evidence base has failed to acknowledge this in the methodology and for this reason the policy cannot be said to be justified based on proportionate evidence.

Housing

7.10 Paragraph 47 requires that local authorities to ensure that their plan meets the objectively assessed housing need for housing consistent with the policies in the framework. Where an authority has a persistent record of undelivery, a 20% buffer should he added (moved forward from later in the plan period).

7.11 Guildford Borough Council has completed 728 dwellings in the past 3 years, on average less than 250 a year, and less than 300 a year over the past 7 years, failing to meet the targets carried over from the South East Plan.

7.12 In light if this record of persistent undelivery, there is no dispute that a 20% buffer should be applied. However, the local authority has made clear that it is not possible to deliver the 20% buffer along with the accrued shortfall (2,019 units) in the first five years. In accordance with the NPPF, the plan should make provision for 6,177 units in the first 5 years. As the plan has not identified sufficient land to meet with this requirement in line with the NPPF, the plan has not been positively prepared and is therefore not sound in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

7.13 Notwithstanding the above, Guildford are unlikely to meet with the housing targets set out in Policy S2; these are staggered over the plan period. The approach of staggering the housing targets over the plan period is unsound. In reality this is only likely to exacerbate housing supply issues later on in the plan period.

7.14 The delivery of the strategic sites is vital to meeting the overall housing supply. The plan however does not specify however if these sites are to be delivered in the short (0-5 years), medium (6-10 years) or longer (11-15 years) term. The plan states they will be delivered in 1-15 years, this is not in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

7.15 In a wider economic context, it is important to acknowledge that the implications of Brexit on housing delivery are likely to be severe. There are a number of factors that are likely to have an impact on housing delivery, these issues are most likely to manifest in the delivery of large-scale strategic sites being developed by national house builders. For these reasons we believe that more emphasis should be placed on the identification of small-medium sized sites in addition to the allocation of additional strategic sites.

7.16 With regards to housing the plan is not effective; it is not deliverable over the plan.

To this end, it is not sound.

Use of Evidence Base
7.17 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF states that wherever possible the local authority should consider how the preparation of an assessment will contribute to the plan’s evidence base. It requires that the process should start early in the plan-making process and key stakeholders should be consulted in identifying issues.

7.18 With regards to the assessments that have informed the open space policy, i.e. the Guildford Open Space, Sport & Recreation Assessment 2016 – 2033 (June 2016) in and the Assessment of Sites for Amenity Value (May 2016), their preparation has not been in accordance with national planning policy.

7.19 These assessments were published in May and June 2016. These then informed policies which were included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for the first time upon its publication in June 2016.

7.20 The open space allocations were not in the previous iteration of the Local Plan and, as such, this did not give interested parties an opportunity to comment on these policies or indeed any time to prepare any rebuttal to these designations with supporting evidence, for example, an arboricultural survey, ecological survey, open space assessment or landscape and visual impact assessment. The opportunity to provide such evidence would have provided a more robust evidence base and a sounder basis for allocation.

7.21 To this end, the plan is not justified and has not been considered against other alternatives or based on proportionate evidence. This is clearly an unsound approach to plan making.

** Recommended Modification of the Plan **

Due to the open space designation being unsound, it is respectfully requested that the Inspector removes the open space allocation from the site. With specific regard to the site, the open space designation is not necessary with the existing TPO.

Notwithstanding any inaccuracies in the evidence base, the process of allocating open space commenced too late in the plan making process. We are therefore also of the view that the entire open space allocations should be re-consulted upon.

If the Inspector is of the view that the open space allocation is justified, the applicant would like to recommend a modification to the allocation.

The modification would involve the decreasing the size of the open space allocation to the area shown on the site layout plan (Appendix 1). This would comprise a 1ha strip of open space along the northern boundary of the site. This would retain the trees which contribute to visual amenity.

This modification would also be compatible with the development of the inner parts of the site. Should any application for development be made on the site; the Send Surrey Ltd could consider making this strip of land accessible to the public, to be used as public open space (although the site would be held by Send Surrey Ltd). This would significantly improve the function of the area as open land, however this will only be achievable if delivered as part of a housing development and any such development will only be feasible if the proposed open space allocation for the site is removed.

The plan does not provide sufficient land for housing to meet the objectively assessed need as required by the NPPF. We recommend that the plan is re-consulted upon and further sites identified to meet the housing supply requirements consistently over the plan period. The current approach is not sound and is likely to exacerbate housing supply issues later on in the plan period.

In addition, the housing targets are have been modified so that the local authority has some prospect of maintaining a 5YHLS, however, in doing so, this will stop development coming forward on the basis of there being no 5YHLS. This again, will exacerbate housing supply issues later on in the plan period.

Allowing housing application to come forward and be assessed in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply is an important function of the NPPF with regards to boosting the supply of housing. Staggering the annual housing to avoid such a circumstance prevailing is
counterproductive as it restricts this key function of the NPPF to boost supply. Therefore we believe the housing targets must be annualised over the plan and recommend this as a modification.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
- Send Surrey Ltd PSLP Response Statement1.jpg (69 KB)
- Send Surrey Ltd Indicative Site Layout.pdf (294 KB)
- Send Surrey Ltd PSLP Response Statement2.jpg (70 KB)
- Send Surrey Ltd PSLP Response Statement.jpg (68 KB)

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7827  **Respondent:** 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7954  **Respondent:** 15688385 / OSP Architecture (David Cranmer)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Executive Summary**

The site is deliverable, located sustainably, has good potential for vehicular and pedestrian connectivity and is enclosed by defensible boundaries formed from existing and consented development ensuring the openness of the Green Belt is not affected.

Accordingly, the site was supported to accommodate significant residential development by the April 2014 Green Belt and Countryside Study and the July 2014 draft Local Plan.

However, the rationale set out within the 2016 Housing Delivery Topic Paper applies a blanket approach which results in the site not being allocated in the draft Local Plan 2016. Such an approach denies the opportunity to consider the value of the site as demonstrated by its exclusion from the 2016 sustainability appraisal despite it being considered an allocated site in the 2014 draft Local Plan. This approach, which does not consider the comparative value of this deliverable site, calls the soundness of the Local Plan into question.

Based on a comparative assessment of the site, its sustainability and deliverability it should be included in the Local Plan as a residential allocation contributing to meeting the housing need of the Borough.

**1.0 Introduction**

1.1 This document will consider the sites involvement in the Guildford Borough Local Plan process to date, whether the site could be developed, how the site compared to those proposed to be allocated in the Local Plan and whether the site should be allocated for residential development in the Local Plan.
1.2 This document should be read in conjunction with the submitted Site Appraisal and covering letter.

2.0 The site and the local plan process 2013-2016

October 2013 Issues and options

2.1 The site was not included in the 2013 Issues and Options document on the basis that the Council did not consider that the site was deliverable as the owner had not responded to the call for sites. However, Mr Cook, of his own volition entered into dialogue at the time concerned that the Council had not approached him.

April 2014 Greenbelt and Countryside Study

2.2 The site was thereafter considered in the Green Belt and Countryside Study of which the relevant part (volume V) identified parcel of land B16A as the application site (plus some surrounding land). The Study, the relevant extract of which is attached at Appendix A, was published in April 2014 prior to the draft Local Plan 2014 being published.

2.3 The Study, which considered whether Send has capacity for a ‘Major Village Expansion’, categorised the wider area the site lies in as a ‘high sensitivity’ Green Belt area. However, it made several observations that the site:

- “is relatively unconstrained in environmental capacity terms”;
- “has a bus service rating of 3 within GBC’s Settlement Hierarchy document which is classed as a good service”;
- “provides opportunities for pedestrian linkages to the River Wey towpath connecting to Old Woking and vehicular access to the A247 Send Road via Tannery Lane”;
- “provides an opportunity to form a waterfront development”;
- “Send scored highly in terms of total community facilities and was ranked 5th in terms of the sustainability assessments within the GBC settlement hierarchy”
- “the score of 24 in terms of community facilities is higher than a number of similar sized settlements”;
- “provides opportunities to accommodate a major expansion without significantly compromising the openness of the wider Green Belt across the Borough”;
- “would not result in settlement coalescence due to the physical separation provided”;
- “would not likely affect any historic setting” and
- “the impact on openness would be limited be enclosure provided by treebelts following the River Wey Navigation to the north, treebelts following Tannery Lane and hedgerows to the east”.

2.4 In conclusion the Study “considered that a Potential Major development Area at land parcel B16A (which includes the site) to the north of Send would be appropriate as a major village expansion as the sustainability credentials outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt”.

2.5 It was therefore not surprising that the site was included for residential development in the draft Local Plan 2014.

July 2014 draft Local Plan (Regulation 18)

2.6 The site, as part of a wider parcel of land including Clockbarn Nurseries and land to the south of Tannery Lane, was included for up to 215 residential dwellings in the draft Local Plan 2014 an extract of which is attached at Appendix B.

2.7 In allocating the site the draft Local Plan recognised that “there is an opportunity to provide a mix of uses in this area, resulting in leisure facilities and new homes (including at least 45% affordable homes), close to a strategic employment site (Send business centre). This also makes use of the former nursery that is now disused”.

August 2014 draft Sustainability Appraisal

2.8 The sites allocation for residential development in the 2014 draft Local Plan was further strengthened by the sites high score in the subsequent 2014 draft sustainability appraisal an extract of which is attached at Appendix C.

September 2015 planning approval for the construction of a marina (14/P/02289)
2.9 The sites allocation was again further supported by the approval, in September 2015, of a marina to serve the River Wey Navigation a plan of which is attached at Appendix D. By allowing the application the Council, due to the existing Send Business Centre and Clockbarn Nurseries, enclosed the site changing its character and bringing it within the form of Send.

June 2016 Sustainability Appraisal

2.10 It was surprising, given the Council had previously not only accepted the benefits of, but had actively promoted, the site as a residential allocation, that the site was not considered by the June 2016 sustainability appraisal. This is confirmed by an e-mail from the Council attached at Appendix F.

2.11 This is particularly surprising given that the methodology of the Sustainability Appraisal states (at paragraphs 5.13 and 5.14) that:

“Specifically, in-line with regulatory requirements, there is a need to explain how work was undertaken to develop and then appraise reasonable alternatives, and how the Council then took into account appraisal findings when finalising the Proposed Submission Plan.

More specifically still, this part of the report sets out to present information regarding the consideration of reasonable alternative spatial strategies, i.e. alternative approaches to the allocation of land to meet housing (and economic) needs”.

2.12 Given that the site has previously been considered appropriate for development, and this was confirmed by the draft 2014 Sustainability Appraisal, the fact that the site, as a realistic prospect for accommodation residential development, was not even considered by the 2016 Sustainability Appraisal is surprising and must call into question the soundness of the draft Local Plan.

June 2016 Housing Delivery Topic Paper

2.13 The rationale for applying a blanket restraint on the site is set out in the Housing Delivery Topic Paper 2016 which seeks to focus residential development as follows:

<see attachment>

2.14 This approach disregards the previous assessment of the site that lead to its positive score in the 2014 draft Sustainability Appraisal and its inclusion as an allocation in the 2014 draft Local Plan. Not only does it disregard this previous work but it prohibits any assessment of the site at all going forward because it is currently sited in the green belt. Such an approach gives no weight to the conclusions of the 2014 Countryside and Green Belt Study (which considered the site favourably) or the change in circumstances at the site (i.e. its enclosure by the approval of the marina, the proposed allocation of Clockbarn Nurseries and existing development) which could arguably lead to the conclusion that site should not be included within the Green Belt designation.

2.15 This approach applies too much weight to the Green Belt designation at too early a stage in the Local Plan process and relies heavily of large allocations being deliverable early within the plan process which, accordingly, calls into question the soundness of the Local Plan.

June 2016 Local Plan (Regulation 19)

2.16 Given the methodology that had been set out in the Housing Delivery Topic Paper it was not possible for the site to be considered for inclusion by the Council in the draft Local Plan 2016. However, development is proposed at Send on Clockbarn nursery and this is set out in the extract from the local plan at Appendix G.

3.0 Should the Green Belt designation be changed?

3.1 The site was included in the Green Belt by the 2003 Guildford Local Plan. However, the context of the site has changed since this time with its increasing integration into Send. To the north the site is bounded by the River Wey Navigation and the consented marina, to the north east by Send Business Centre, to the east by the vehicular access to the consented marina, to the south by Clockbarn nursery and to west by residential development adjoining Send Road.
3.2 It is therefore appropriate to consider whether the Green Belt designation should still apply to the site by assessing it against the five tests set out at paragraph 80 of the NPPF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPPF Test</th>
<th>The Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”</td>
<td>The proposed site would infill between existing and consented development having little impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another”</td>
<td>Development of the site would not lead to the actual, nor perceived, merging of two settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment”</td>
<td>The presence of Send Business Centre, Clockbarn Nurseries and the consented marina has introduced development around the site. The development of the site would not extend the built form of Send into the countryside as it has already occurred at this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”</td>
<td>The development of the site would not harm the setting or special character of a historic town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land”</td>
<td>To meet the housing need of the Borough development must occur and it is appropriate to direct it to the least harmful locations with regard to protecting the countryside. Due to the existing and consented development surrounding the site its development would not be considered as encouraging development within the countryside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Given the above it can be reasonably considered that the site does not portray the characteristics of a site within the Green Belt as it does not contribute to the openness of the Green Belt due to the presence of existing and consented development enclosing the site.

4.0 Can the site be developed?

4.1 As set out within the supporting Site Appraisal the site could be developed without resulting in any demonstrable harm for a range of dwellings from 50 to 140 dwellings in addition to the provision of open space for the local community. This section will consider the reasons why the site is suitable and deliverable within the earliest stages of the draft Local Plans housing delivery trajectory.

4.2 The site is immediately deliverable as the land is within the control of Mr Cook and there are no known legal or ownership issues that would constrain the site coming forward for immediate development.

4.3 The site is located in a sustainable location when regard is had to the economic, social and environmental dimensions.

4.4 The site would not harm the openness of the Green Belt as it has defensible boundaries encompassed by existing and consented development.

4.5 The site is not located within a designated sensitive landscape and does not fall within any other 'sensitive area' as defined in Regulation 2 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011.

4.6 The site can accommodate a high quality of design that respects local distinctiveness in accordance with policy D1 of the draft Local Plan 2016 and includes affordable homes in accordance with policy H2 of the draft Local Plan 2016.
4.7 The site has good existing vehicular access due to the recent formation of an access to the marina and also has the potential to create a further access onto Tannery Land and offer vehicular permeability to the site allocated to the immediate south at Clockbarn Nurseries.

4.8 The amenity of occupiers of the existing residential dwellings to the western boundary of the site can be respected through careful design and layout.

4.9 The site is located close to local services and facilities and can support safe and easily accessible pedestrian permeability to these facilities and services.

4.10 The site can provide open space for the benefit of the local community. Open space would be provided in each phase of development option one as follows: phase one 0.65ha; phase two 0.33ha; and phase three 0.72ha. If development option two is chosen the same would apply but a further 1.55ha of open space would be provided in lieu of phase three. This could include the potential expansion of the marina.

4.11 The introduction of residential development would respect the River Wey Corridor the policy designation for which is arbitrarily drawn. The proposed development would enhance the purposes of establishing the River Wey Corridor by providing opportunities to improve education by increasing understanding of the River Wey Navigation and its associated habitats in accordance with policy E6 of the draft Local Plan 2016. Therefore, the introduction of residential development would enhance the River Wey Corridor Conservation Area in accordance with policy D3 of the draft Local Plan 2016.

4.12 The site would support economic development in Send supporting existing employment sites such as at Send Business Centre. This is in accordance with policy E5 of the draft Local Plan 2016.

4.13 The site is not of any significant agricultural value as it primarily constitutes infill from the excavation of the adjacent (now full) landfill site that was previously formed of gravel.

4.14 Because of the history of the infilling of the surface of the site all the material imported was certified as clear so the site has no known land contamination.

4.15 Whilst the northern part of the site identified as a mineral safeguarding zone no evidence has been put forward by Surrey County Council to state why this particular parcel of land has an overriding value in that regard.

4.16 The site can be connected to existing gas, electricity, telecommunication, foul sewerage and water services.

4.17 The site is within EA Flood Zone one where the introduction of residential development is considered acceptable. A Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SUDS) would complement a landscaping strategy.

4.18 The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

4.19 The ecological value of the site is primarily within the existing hedgerows and mature trees along the field boundaries and River Wey Navigation corridor on the northern part of the site. These habitats would be enhanced by the introduction of residential development.

5.0 Comparison with sites proposed to be allocated in the 2016 draft Local Plan

5.1 The methodology employed through the adoption of the Housing Delivery Topic Paper results in a situation whereby many smaller extensions to the Green Belt to accommodate sustainable, deliverable and often appropriate development cannot be considered.

5.2 The methodology also results in significant allocations to large sites being relied upon heavily to meet the housing needs of the Borough – such as almost 4,000 dwellings through extensions to Guildford and 2,000 dwellings at the former Wisley airfield. This places significant pressure on these larger sites, often funded by international finance, to meet the housing need rather than spreading the allocations in a more robust and measured way which reflects the financing structure of smaller sites that often renders them more deliverable as they are robust from international economic pressures.
5.3 The methodology also places significant weight on the Green Belt designation whereas often a development outside of, but adjacent to, the Green Belt may have more of an impact on it than an infill development such as that this representation advocates. This is clearly the case here in that the assessment of the proposed development on the purposes of the Green Belt results in the conclusion that there is little impact on the openness of the Green Belt due to the surrounding existing and consented development. However, as an example, the proposed allocation at Burntcommon (sites A43 and A43A) are located next to the A3 within the Green Belt and have a much greater impact that would be appreciated by far greater people than the site north of Tannery Land.

5.4 A further example is presented by the limited agricultural value of the site as a result of it being formed from extracted material from the adjacent former landfill to the South of Tannery Lane. This is in stark contrast to the high agricultural value of other allocated sites.

5.5 It is this level of assessment that the blanket methodology has restricted and, in doing so, the soundness of the emerging Local Plan must be called into question.

6.0 Should the site be allocated for residential development in the local plan?

6.1 It has been demonstrated that the site is deliverable, located sustainably, has good potential for vehicular and pedestrian connectivity and is enclosed by defensible boundaries ensuring the purpose of the Green Belt is not affected.

6.2 It has been further demonstrated that the previous designation of the land as within the Green Belt should be reconsidered in light of existing and consented development that encompasses the site and reduces its openness.

6.3 However, the rationale set out within the 2016 Housing Delivery Topic Paper applies a blanket approach which results in the site not being allocated in the draft Local Plan 2016. Such an approach denies the opportunity to consider the comparative value of this deliverable site and calls the soundness of the Local Plan into question.

6.4 Based on a comparative assessment of the site, its sustainability and deliverability it should be included in the Local Plan as a residential allocation contributing to meeting the housing need of the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Tannery Lane - Policy Appraisal.pdf (6.7 MB)
Tannery Lane - Cover Letter.pdf (319 KB)
Tannery Lane - Site Appraisal.pdf (3.0 MB)
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Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<full document attached>

1.1 Executive Summary

The site is deliverable, located sustainably, has good potential for vehicular and pedestrian connectivity and is enclosed by defensible boundaries formed from existing and consented development ensuring the openness of the Green Belt is not affected.
Based on a comparative assessment of the site, its sustainability and deliverability it should be included in the Local Plan as a residential allocation contributing to meeting the housing need of the borough.

1.2 Purpose of this document

This document provides a site appraisal and indicative layout to illustrate the development potential of land adjacent to the village of Send, to support a representation to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites consultation June 2016. This appraisal should be read in conjunction with the Policy Appraisal and covering letter which, along with two indicative plans, form the representation to the Regulation 19 Local Plan consultation.

1.3 Site Location

The site currently consists of approximately 4.6 hectares of low value agricultural land. Planning permission has been secured for a Marina to enhance the facilities of the River Wey Navigation to the north of the site. The River Wey Navigation defines the northern boundary of the site, whilst the rear of houses along Wharf Lane and Send Road abut the site’s western boundary. Tannery Lane runs along much of the site’s eastern boundary, providing access into the site (potentially from the existing marina access).

The former Clockbarn Nurseries lies along the southern side of the site, and has been allocated for development in the draft Local Plan 2016 (Policy A42). The development of the adjoining site (subject to this representation) will deliver housing in this sustainable location, while integrating with the development of the Nurseries land to form a natural extension of the village, with the River Wey Navigation marina and Send Business Centre naturally defining the limits of the development.

2.1 Site Context

The Send Parish Plan 2007 provides a useful overview of the village. Send is described as a thriving Surrey village of 1600 households. The village has a long history, and is mentioned in the Domesday Book. It has grown from a small settlement around the New Inn and the adjacent river crossing, with pre-war housing built along Send Road. Further areas of linear housing along Potters Lane and Send Road and housing areas around Send Marsh and Burnt Common were built in the post-war period.

Send benefits from a range of local facilities including:

- Shops, local services, pub and cafés/ restaurants, mostly concentrated in the local centre;
- Post office;
- Employment provision including at Send Business Centre and Vision Engineering;
- Recreational facilities including recently improved play and exercise facilities at the Recreation Ground, as well as the public rights of way network which gives access to the local countryside and Wey Navigation;
- Send Church of England First School and St Bede’s Church of England Junior School;
- The Villages’ Medical Centre and chemist; and
- Community facilities and places of worship including St Mary’s Church, Send Methodist Church, Send Village Club and Lancaster Hall.

The majority of these facilities are located within easy walking distance of the site.

2.2 Local Character

A study has been undertaken of the character of Send with the aim of identifying the key features of the settlement. This analysis has been used to guide the design of the proposed development.

The density of residential development within the village varies, with densities often being below 25 dwellings to the hectare. However, a recent development at Sandfields was developed at a density of 31 dwellings per hectare, and the Walnut Tree Place development is slightly higher at 36 dph. Building heights are predominantly two-storey, with some buildings providing further accommodation within roof...
spaces.
There are also a number of single storey bungalows. Various layouts are evident in the village, with linear traditional development lining the key routes. More recent infill and extensions include cul-de-sac developments and development around small open spaces. Dwellings are detached, semidetached or arranged in short terraces, fronting onto roads. There is also a range of parking provision with many plots providing parking in front of dwellings, although parking is also provided to the side of plots, within garages and on street.

Send has a range of architectural styles, reflecting the different ages of its buildings. Key features include:
• Hanging tiles;
• Brick and render external walls;
• Plain brown or red clay tiles, interlocking tiles and grey slate;
• Hipped, half hipped or gabled ended pitched roofs;
• White sash and casement windows;
• Dormer windows; and
• Brick porches and chimneys.

2.3 Landscape Features
The site benefits from the current key green and blue infrastructure:
• The River Wey Navigation – the Navigation runs along the site’s northern boundary facilitating the approved marina; and
• Trees and hedgerows – the site’s field margins are lined by trees and hedgerows. The development of the site would retain the vast majority of these green assets, using retained and enhanced field boundaries to provide the basis of the landscape framework for the development.

The largely agricultural nature of site means that development is not expected to have significant adverse ecological effects. Indeed, a the introduction of residential development has the potential to deliver ecological enhancements through the provision of new aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitats.

A scheme can be developed for the site which ensures that there are no unacceptable impacts on the ecology of the wider area, including designated sites such as the Papercourt Marches SSSI to the east.

2.4 Connectivity and Access
As set out above, the site benefits from being in close proximity to a range of local facilities, and thus provides opportunities for journeys to be made on foot or by bicycle. Pedestrian and cycle facilities around the site are currently poor with a lack of footway on most of Tannery Lane and no cycle lanes or off street routes in the close vicinity of the site. The development of the site provides the opportunity to contribute to the improvement of facilities for these transport modes for the benefit of the local community.

A number of public rights of way run close to site boundaries, providing an existing network into which the development can connect. There is the opportunity to enhance the network with additional links.

Vehicular access to the site is provided by Tannery Lane, and the development of the site can contribute to any necessary works to improve the junction of Tannery Lane, Send Road and Sandy Lane. Tannery Lane is currently used by HGVs accessing the Send Business Centre, and the development could contribute to measures to improve the road alignment to enable vehicles to pass more easily.

The nearest bus stops are located on Send Road within 150 metres of the site. Arriva 462 and 463 bus routes serve these stops, combining to provide an hourly service between Guildford and Woking through Send.

2.5 Flood Risk
Although the low lying surrounding context of the site is dominated by water, the site itself lies within Flood Zone 1, the least vulnerable designation that is therefore the most suitable for residential development. The residential development of the site would include proposals to sustainably address surface water issues, ensuring that the development at least maintains current volumes and quality of surface water run off.

2.6 Landscape Character and Views

The key landscape features of the site consist of the blue and green infrastructure set out above. The residential development of the site would retain and enhance these features as far as possible. The visual effects of the scheme on the Wey and Godalming Navigations Conservation Area would be a key consideration, with appropriate setting back of buildings and landscaping to minimise visual effects and ensure that the development preserves and enhances the Conversation Area.

The relatively flat nature of the site and its context, and the existing trees and hedgerows result in a site that is visually self contained. Careful consideration would need to given to immediate views into the site, particularly from adjacent residential development. The treatment of boundaries and inclusion of landscape buffers would be important in providing visual screening.

2.7 Site Opportunities and Constraints

The above analysis has highlighted a number of key opportunities and constraints which provide the framework for the residential development of the site. These are:

• The site provides the opportunity to deliver a mix of new homes, including affordable homes for local people, in a sustainable location close to local facilities;
• The River Wey Navigation is a key site feature and provides the opportunity to create a high quality waterside environment. The need to protect or improve the special character of the Navigation is also a constraint;
• Tannery Lane can provide accesses to the site at a range of locations, and the scheme provides the opportunity to improve the alignment of the lane;
• The development of the site can contribute to improvements to the junction of Tannery Lane, Sandy Lane and Send Road to ensure that additional vehicular traffic can be suitably accommodated within the road network;
• The scheme will need to carefully consider the relationship with adjacent existing development;
• The existing pedestrian network (including public rights of way) must be retained, and forms the basis for the creation of new linkages. There is an opportunity to improve the currently poor cycle and pedestrian provision in the vicinity of the site, including improved footway provision on Tannery Lane. Send Road currently acts as a barrier to pedestrian movement, and there is the opportunity to provide crossings at the junction with Tannery Lane;
• Development of the site must ensure that there is no adverse impact on nearby designated sites, including the Site of Nature Conservation Importance and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. There is the opportunity to enhance the site’s ecological value; and
• Existing trees and hedgerows that contribute to the character of the site should be retained and guide the layout of the scheme. These provide the starting point for the development of a high quality landscape framework for the site.

3.1 Residential Site Allocation

Indicative plans setting out how residential development could be accommodated on the site have been developed to illustrate how it could deliver an attractive extension to the village. The scheme has the potential to deliver up to 140 units (development option 1) and can be developed in phases, or in part.

The Concept Plan opposite (page 17) shows indicatively how the units could be laid out on the site.

Development option 2 (shown overleaf (page 18)) shows an approach that could accommodate 90 dwellings but retains a large area of open space adjacent to the Wey Navigation for the purposes of further respecting the setting of the River
Wey Navigation, providing valuable amenity space for the local community and enabling additional ecological enhancement.

3.2 Delivering New Homes

The extension to the village can be well-integrated with the existing and proposed adjacent built form. The figures provided indicate a density of approximately 30 dwellings per hectare, reflecting a balance between the objectives of making the best use of the land while at the same time respecting the local character of Send.

Building heights would be predominantly two storey, with some dwellings having accommodation in the roof. The scheme could accommodate a mixture of unit types, sizes, styles and tenures, and will include affordable housing for local people. The marina and Wey River Navigation provide the opportunity to develop waterside units, the design of which can draw on marine themes. Architectural detailing and materials can make reference to the local vernacular as evident in the character of the local area (see Section 2). Thus elements such as brick and render external walls, plain clay tiles and slate for roofs, hanging tiles, decorative brickwork, brick porches and chimneys, and white sash and casement windows would be likely to feature within the scheme.

3.3 Access and Movement

Vehicular access could be provided from Tannery Lane to serve the development both from a new access point to the south of the approved marina access (or in combination with the marina access), and through the adjacent Clockbarn Nurseries development.

As set out in Section 2, the scheme can contribute to improvements to the alignment and width of Tannery Lane, as well as to the junction of Tannery Lane, Sandy Lane and Send Road. These improvements would address any issues created by additional traffic created by the development, and would also improve local pedestrian infrastructure by providing safe crossing facilities for Send Road. New pedestrian links can be provided to connect with the existing pedestrian network, and there may be potential for the scheme to contribute to the delivery of a new footway along Tannery Lane close to the village centre.

3.4 Landscape Strategy and Open Space

The proposed residential development would be delivered with a high quality landscape strategy including the following key elements:

- Existing trees and hedgerows of value to be retained and enhanced, and forming an important input into the layout of the scheme;
- A significant landscape buffer zone to be provided along the Wey Navigation;
- Further landscape buffer zones and planting to be provided between the proposed development and neighbouring residential areas;
- Linear open spaces and gardens to provide visual and green links through the development;
- The adjacent marina and associated landscaping would form a key landscape feature to which the residential development can respect; and
- A series of open spaces would be incorporated into the scheme, connected by green links through the development. Providing green links to the waterside would be a key feature of the strategy.

3.5 Local Facilities

In addition to bringing forward new homes including affordable housing, the site’s developers would enter into a legal agreement (or make payments under the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy) to provide significant financial contributions towards local infrastructure and services. A site specific legal agreement may also be required to contribute to the upgrading of the access to the site. The exact nature and amount of these contributions will be defined as the proposals progress, but it is envisaged they will relate to issues such as healthcare, children’s services, education, sports and leisure provision.
3.6 Sustainability

The proposals have the potential to deliver a sustainable development in its broadest sense. Key aspects of the sustainability of the scheme could include:

• Scheme layout to maximise solar gain and natural lighting through the orientation of the majority of the dwellings to the south, east and west;
• Sustainable energy including energy efficiency measures and possible generation of power from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources;
• Amenity space and access to the waterside;
• A safe and secure design underpinned by Secured by Design principles;
• Transport design to encourage walking and cycling for local trips;
• Protection and enhancement of the site’s ecological value;
• Use of sustainable and locally sourced materials wherever possible;
• An integrated approach to water demand and rainwater disposal using sustainable urban drainage systems as far as possible; and
• A waste management strategy to promote resource efficiency in construction and encourage recycling in operation.

3.7 Place-Making

Character
• Traditional Surrey vernacular integrated into the village.
• Brickwork and render, hanging tiles, plain tile and slate roofs.
• Gabled, half hipped and hipped roofs.
• Decorative brickwork and traditional chimneys and porches.
• White framed windows and doors, bay windows.
• Contemporary waterside development.
• Waterside housing drawing on marine theme with potential for timber boarding and balconies. Street Scene
• Homes to provide frontages to activate streets.
• Hedges, timber fences, open meadow areas, gravel paths.
• Detached, semi-detached and short runs of terraced housing.
• Shared surfaces on lanes.

Landscaping and Open Space
• Retain the existing trees as far as possible.
• A landscape buffer zone along the Wey Navigation.
• Open spaces and gardens providing green links through the development.
• Play space for children.

Working with the Village
• Easy walking and cycling to the village centre and facilities.
• Pedestrian crossing facilities on Send Road.
• Financial contributions to local facilities.
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- I object to the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send which will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

- I object to the fact that this is even a consideration. Has anybody from the Council driven through these areas, specifically in rush hour time?
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I wish object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- There is an increase from 45 homes to 60 homes which is more than a 33% increase in plan
- There are currently access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction and this plan will only exacerbate all the issues
- River Wey Navigation open countryside views will be impacted
- Obviously there will be further erosion of the Green Belt, and that will make it worse for the village
- Current water surface flooding is already bad and this plan will make it worse
- You have blatantly ignored the previous objections made by local peoples which run into hundreds.
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My husband and I strongly object to Policy A42 as it now stands because we look out of our window on weekday mornings now and see the queues of traffic in Send Marsh Road trying to get out onto the Portsmouth Road. To build more houses which would add to it is absolutely crazy. In the 14 years we have lived here the traffic has increased enormously- it has to stop somewhere and we consider it cannot handle such proposed development.
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I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

33% increase 45 homes to 60 is too much.

It creates traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.

Loss of Green Belt to our village.

Creates more surface water flooding.

Loss of countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane Send because :-

• The 33% INCREASE from 45 to 60 homes is not acceptable because there is insufficient space in the site unless the Council is happy to build slums of the future!
• All previous objections regaring this development have been ignored
• The infrastructure, particularly the width of Tannery Lane, cannot accommodate the increased traffic generated by this scheme and Send Business Park. Hence there is a risk of traffic accidents within Tannary Lane and it junction with the A247 which has poor sight lines.
• The increase in effluent requiring treatment at Ripley Sewerage works, together with other proposed schemes could result in difficulties in confirming with the Water Framework Directive in relation to the discharge of treated effluent into the river Wey/Wey Navigation canal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase by 33% of homes to be developed, from 45 to 60, is too many for such a small area. It ignores all my previous objections to this proposal and, in fact, has made it worse than before even though I, and many others, objected strongly to this proposal. It worsens traffic issues in Tannery Lane, which is already a small single lane in places, and erodes the green belt. There is increased risk of flooding due to surface run off and it will affect the natural topology and countryside around the area which has already been designated as Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
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- The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
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Policy A42 – I object to Policy A42 as the infrastructure of Send cannot manage such an increase in housing. Traffic is already unmanageable in the village and at peak times can take between 15-20 minutes to get out of Send; significantly impacting journey times to schools and work. This is also against previous objections made by local residents and will impact the surrounding countryside / greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
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Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/394  Respondent: 17168001 / Henry Knights  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
street parking around here, this junction will become increasingly dangerous. This is on Green Belt land that should be saved to allow for surface drainage. Send is a village and this level of unsympathetic development will ruin the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/504</th>
<th>Respondent: 17178113 / Laura Frankland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object to Policy A42 change - Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because this increase is too much. It will worsen access and traffic problems already in Tannery Lane and at the junction of the A247. Tannery Lane is a picturesque country lane that forms part of the Village of Send and we wish to protect the views, wildlife and green open spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/541</th>
<th>Respondent: 17184417 / Donald Pedonis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In regard to the local plan 2017;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the policy A42 at Clockbarn in Tannery lane because of the traffic primarily. This area has become a rat run from Old Woking and Woking to the M25 some evening it is hopeless to even try driving. Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes is unacceptable increase, which will certainly create a huge burden on traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/572</th>
<th>Respondent: 17186433 / Richard W Baldwin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan has ignored previous objection by residents of Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an increase, over the previous plan, of 15 homes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannery Lane, and especially its junction with the A247, is unsuitable for more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The area is subject to surface water flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/577  Respondent: 17189057 / Kathryn Fox  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to raise further objections to plans for the Send area. Please find a summary of my objections as follows:

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and is already too much
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people that live in Send
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
• The local school and doctor’s surgery are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/681  Respondent: 17200033 / Eileen Barr  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the Policy A42 change at Tannery Lane because increasing the number of homes from 45 to 60 will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction, it is an erosion of the Green Belt and will impact open countryside views.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/766  Respondent: 17205089 / Janet A Parry-Moms  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Guildford Local Plan 2017 as shown below: I object to the Policy A 42 change at Clockbam in Tannery Lane because: The increase in the number of houses to 60 from 45 is too much. Previous objections from local people
have been ignored. Traffic access problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction would worsen. Green Belt would be eroded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/764  Respondent: 17205121 / Madeleine Davis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbam Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The large number of previous objections made by the local people has been ignored.
• The increase from 45 homes to 60 homes is too high.
• It will make worse the traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
• There is already surface water flooding and this will make it worse.
• The open countryside views from the River Way will be ruined.
• The Green Belt in our area has already been eroded and this will worsen the situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/773  Respondent: 17205249 / Dorothy Ann Sprigings  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the junction of Tannery Lane and the A247 is bad for access and the increase from 45 to 60 homes will make it even worse. It will also be worse along the narrow Tannery Lane.

it further erodes the Green Belt around Send village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/796  Respondent: 17206177 / Ian William Groden  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
**Land at Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42**

**Objection**

Send’s contribution has been increased at this site with no justification despite a reduction in overall housing numbers in the borough and the large number of previous objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/834  **Respondent:** 17206209 / Jenna Crombie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the amendment made to A42 - increasing rather than decreasing the impact/burden of the Local Plan on the village of Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/807  **Respondent:** 17206433 / Rosalie Hewitt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A42 Tannery Lane, Send

- Proposed increase from 45 to 60 houses will have a significant impact on the highly congested local rural road network for example, Polesden Lane, Tannery Lane, Papercourt Lane and would impact on Send which is already at saturation point especially during peak hours

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/824  **Respondent:** 17207105 / Caroline Minter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane - I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn because it will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse and the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/851</th>
<th>Respondent: 17209729 / Roger William Bakewell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to object strongly to the change in the above policy, an increase to 60 homes in place of the original 45.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst I was aware of the above plan for 45 homes, I had not experienced the effect of traffic in Tannery and Papercourt Lanes. These roads are already totally unsuitable for all but the most minimal traffic. They are almost completely single track with no formal passing places other than at the Tannery Industrial units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hard standing in front of my bungalow is an 'unofficial' passing place. This morning there was a complete blockage outside with 2 vehicles encroaching on my property in an effort to clear the blockage. The speed limit is regularly exceeded. Recently there was a serious accident at the sharp bend just up from my property. Please note this email may be provided in evidence in any related accident investigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear these Lanes are already 'rat' runs for those seeking another route to Woking or the M25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase of homes in the above plan to 60 will increase the possibility of extra cars using these Lanes from 90 to 120, assuming the majority of households have at least 2 cars. This will cause complete chaos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to not proceeding with this increase in homes, the council should take other traffic reduction/calming measures such a 'access only' stretches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/852</th>
<th>Respondent: 17209761 / Philippa Lawrence</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A42 objection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing to object to the recently revised policy for Clockbarn Nursery on Tannery Lane. The newly proposed development of now 60 homes rather than the previously proposed 45 is too much. It is an uplift of 33% more and ignores all of the previous hundreds of objections raised. Tannery Lane is a very tight lane and the main road onto which it leads is already high with traffic from the neighbouring villages using as a through road to access the A3. The area simply cannot handle the additional traffic such a development would bring with it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/858</th>
<th>Respondent: 17210145 / Tim Crook</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/941  Respondent: 17221377 / Mr s Sinai  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As residents of Burnt Common our area has been threatened with irreversible and excessive development on all sides completely destroying what is left of our rural landscape.

I object to policy a42 change at clock barn in Tannery Lane because;

there has been a 33% increase in planned new homes from 45 to 60 ignoring hundreds of previous objections and adding to traffic congestion at the a247 junction. Contributing to increased surfaced water flooding which already exists. It will impact on the countryside surrounding the river wey navigation and it is greenbelt land which should not be built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1100  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1208  Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) 
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1379  Respondent: 17267265 / Patricia & Normal Bloomfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and is already too much
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people that live in Send
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
• The local school and doctor’s surgery are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1380  Respondent: 17267265 / Patricia & Normal Bloomfield  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and is already too much
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people that live in Send
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
• The local school and doctor’s surgery are already at capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1400  Respondent: 17268385 / Kirsten Mellow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change as the increased number of homes proposed for the Clockbarn nursery site fails to account for the previous objections to the original 45 houses proposed for this site. I am concerned that it will have a significant negative impact upon traffic along tannery lane and, in particular, the junction between tannery lane and the A247. I am also concerned that this development is will negatively impact upon the Wey Navigation, as it will impede what are currently open countryside views protected by the Greenbelt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1646  Respondent: 17283457 / Trudy Hills  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Cockbarn in tannery lane because:

- I believe it should not take place in the first place, however a further increase in the number of homes is proposed which make the situation even worse
- The traffic in this area is getting worse and especially at the A247 junction
- Green belt land is protected in law and I see no reason that it should be built on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1710  Respondent: 17285249 / Stephen Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specifically, I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It will cause extreme congestion at the junction with the A247. Already, at certain times of the day during the working week the whole village is gridlocked. This proposal will only serve to exacerbate the problem
- It will remove greenbelt land which gives the village its ‘village feel’
- It will damage open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation and create an eye sore
- It will risk increasing the likelihood of surface water flooding

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1730  Respondent: 17285569 / Angela Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- It ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will cause terrible traffic problems along SINGLE TRACK Tannery Lane, and at the junction with Send Road (A247)
- It will further (and unnecessarily) erode the Green Belt
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- The increase to 60 homes from 45 homes is opportunistic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1766  Respondent: 17286657 / Kristine Good  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is **33% more** and too much
• It ignores all the **hundreds of previous objections** made by local people
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/1808  Respondent: 17288289 / Ken Grainger  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

The increase to 60 homes is excessive especially as I consider 45 is too many!!

It ignores all the many previous objections raised by the local people

It will serious worsen access and already unacceptable traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

It will make erosion of the Green Belt in Send village worse

It will make surface water flooding a more serious threat than it is at present

It will impact countryside views from the River Way Navigation and will greatly affect the treasured wildlife

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/1828  Respondent: 17288513 / Andrew Bedworth  Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
• It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
• It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1838  Respondent:  17288705 / Lesley Davies  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SITE A42, TANNERY LANE

An increase in size from 45 to 60 homes is proposed. Again, the traffic impact is significant on an already busy road in peak times and the knock on effect on Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1839  Respondent:  17288833 / Beverley Robson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have lived on Send Road for the last 20 years and I have very serious concerns about the changes to the local plan that will significantly impact Send and the surrounding villages.

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people including myself.
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction - there is simply no way this junction can take additional traffic.
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1866  Respondent:  17289697 / Carolyn Sanson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This area of Send is totally unsuitable for building 60 new homes as access via Tannery Lane from Send Road is very dangerous and the lane itself is narrow. It is also part of the Greenbelt and an attractive area of the village to walk.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1884  **Respondent:** 17291329 / Charmian Leach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Further to the above I wish to object to Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, policy A42 because:

- a 33% increase in homes from 45 to 60 is simply too much as the local infrastructure cannot cope e.g. access and traffic issues at A247 junction

- surface water flooding, already an issue, will worsen

- continual erosion of the greenbelt.

- it ignores the hundreds of previous objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1887  **Respondent:** 17291361 / Ron Leach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, policy A42 because:

- a 33% increase in homes from 45 to 60 is simply too much as the local infrastructure cannot cope e.g. access and traffic issues at A247 junction

- surface water flooding, already an issue, will worsen

- continual erosion of the greenbelt.

- it ignores the hundreds of previous objections.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1916  **Respondent:** 17291553 / James Hitchings  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to your loading this North East corner of your Borough with an unfair amount of development whilst removing planned development from other areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2138  Respondent: 17300737 / Katy Di Rienzo  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 (Tannery Lane, Send) because

Subsequent to the previous plan, you have further increased the amount of planned homes from 45 to 60 which is at odds with hundreds of previous objections to this development;

It will place the local roads under further significant strain. This road connects to Send Road (A247) which is a traffic hotspot during peak times with significant load heading into Woking or heading to the A3. Traffic turning into and leaving Tannery Lane causes severe delays and this situation could only worsen with this proposed development;

It erodes the Green Belt in our village and puts pressure on local house values.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2143  Respondent: 17300865 / Felice Di Rienzo  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 (Tannery Lane, Send) because

Subsequent to the previous plan, you have further increased the amount of planned homes from 45 to 60 which is at odds with hundreds of previous objections to this development;

It will place the local roads under further significant strain. This road connects to Send Road (A247) which is a traffic hotspot during peak times with significant load heading into Woking or heading to the A3. Traffic turning into and leaving Tannery Lane causes severe delays and this situation could only worsen with this proposed development;

It erodes the Green Belt in our village and puts pressure on local house values.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2159  Respondent: 17301089 / Amanda Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition, I object to the proposed development on site A42. On the other side of me, I have Tannery Lane, site A42, with the increase from 46 to 60 homes.

What about the affordable housing which is not clearly stated?!

Already at the traffic lights in Send, traffic is held up for several changes of lights. The area cannot take more traffic on the roads.

Already we are blocked in when the newly extended primary school parents block our access. If there was to be a fire or ambulance needed, our homes cannot be accessed as it is. The school can't take any more families. The Doctor's surgery cannot take any more load.

It is not right that 40% of development is in this area, so near to Send Marsh and Wisley Airfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2256Respondent: 17302273 / R SingletonAgent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane
1. I object to your proposal to increase the 60 homes in place of the 45 homes, Which amounts to an increase of 33%. How can you justify this increase?

2. It ignores the hundreds of objections raised by local people already.

3. It will without doubt have a serious impact on traffic levels and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

4. It will also make the erosion of the green belt in Send Village much worse.

5. It will also make surface water flooding, which is already a problem far worse.

6. It will have an effect on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2269Respondent: 17302497 / F BennettAgent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)
This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2325  Respondent:  17303745 / Christine M Macnair  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2408  Respondent:  17308417 / Shirley Bowerman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because the previous plan to build 45 houses on the site was bad enough. The extra 15 houses now proposed will exacerbate the problems and shows contempt to the hundreds of Council taxpayers who previously objected to the 45 houses then proposed. No evidence has been produced to show that any houses are required here, especially for the extra number now proposed.

I object because access and traffic problems will be very much worse in Tannery Lane at the junction with the A247 in Send Road and totally disastrous at the Newark Lane junction. Tannery Lane for most of its length is winding and barely wide enough for one vehicle. There is no footpath and houses abut directly onto the road.

I object because the proposal will worsen erosion of the Green Belt in Send.

I object because surface water is already a serious problem and this proposal will make it very much worse.

I object because the proposal will detract from countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.
Site A42 Tannery Lane, Send

The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. The access from Tannery Lane onto Newark Lane is a single track road, with passing spaces, extra traffic on this road will invariably lead to additional congestion and high possibility of accidents.

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
- It will worsen traffic congestion in the local area which is already busy and often sees heavy traffic during and after peak hours, even when the major roads have cleared.

There is no infrastructure, (schools, roads, shops, etc.), in place or proposed, to support the increased demand that will result from this development. It will increase the risk posed to cyclist using Tannery Lane and the surrounding roads. There is no proposal to improve cyclist's safety on these narrow country roads that will see an increase in motor vehicle traffic. This is of particular concern to me as I transport my children to and from nursery, by bicycle, along these roads.

I suggest that the number of housing be reduced from 60 to 45 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane.
I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2634  Respondent: 17328801 / Adriana Barnes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

The proposed allocation for 45 homes in the previous draft plan on green belt land was objected to & I object to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is unsuitable for the quantity of traffic which would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2637  Respondent: 17329025 / Andrew Hollis  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane, Send, because:

1. a) There is an increase of 33% in the number of homes from 45 to 60. This is far too many for this rural area.

1. b) The traffic along Tannery Lane and at the junction to the A247 (Send Road) is already very busy during rush hour. The increase in houses and therefore traffic will make it intolerable

1. c) Severe water surface flooding will be made even worse.

1. d) It will have a greater impact on the countryside views from the River Wey.

1. e) Hundreds of previous objections from local people seem to have been ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane, Send, because:

a) There is an increase of 33% in the number of homes from 45 to 60. This is far too many for this rural area.

b) The traffic along Tannery Lane and at the junction to the A247 (Send Road) is already very busy during rush hour. The
increase in houses and therefore traffic will make it intolerable  
c) Severe water surface flooding will be made even worse. 
d) It will have a greater impact on the countryside views from the River Wey.  
e) Hundreds of previous objections from local people seem to have been ignored  

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong></th>
<th>pslp172/2642</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>17329217 / Karis Barnes</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane  

The proposed allocation for 45 homes in the previous draft plan on green belt land was objected to & I object to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is unsuitable for the quantity of traffic which would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong></th>
<th>pslp172/2644</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>17329537 / D S White</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane  
The addition of a further 15 residential units to a total of 60 units with the consequent increase in traffic in Tannery Lane and the A247 junction.  
The effect of addition people on the local schools and Doctor's surgery.  
The destruction of the Green Belt by this development.  
The increase in surface water flooding.  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong></th>
<th>pslp172/2942</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong></th>
<th>17344801 / Graham Rendell</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because again this could also radically change the drainage in the area.

Many of my previous points also are reliant on this plan including the increase in traffic and more erosion of the greenbelt.

Given that so many objections were made to the previous plan it seems that by increasing the size of the development with this plan you are totally ignoring the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2778  Respondent: 17357249 / E Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because again this could also radically change the drainage in the area.

Many of my previous points also are reliant to this plan including the increase in traffic and more erosion of the greenbelt.

Given that so many objections were made to the previous plan it seems that by increasing the size of the development with this plan you are totally ignoring the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2825  Respondent: 17366145 / Tara Cooling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane. To increase the number of houses from 45 to 60 is too much and will worsen traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction, not to mention pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2830  Respondent: 17366465 / J F Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because again this could also radically change the drainage in the area.

Many of my previous points also are reliant on this plan including the increase in traffic and more erosion of the greenbelt.

Given that so many objections were made to the previous plan it seems that by increasing the size of the development with this plan you are totally ignoring the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the POLICY A42 changes in respect of Clockharn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, where it is now proposed to build 60 homes in place of 45 ... an increase of 33%, thus invading more Green Belt land This will mean much more traffic along the already very narrow Tannery Lane and also make huge problems, traffic-wise, at its junction with the A247, Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2831  Respondent: 17366465 / J F Harris  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the POLICY A42 changes in respect of Clockharn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send, where it is now proposed to build 60 homes in place of 45 ... an increase of 33%, thus invading more Green Belt land This will mean much more traffic along the already very narrow Tannery Lane and also make huge problems, traffic-wise, at its junction with the A247, Send Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2834  Respondent: 17366881 / Amanda Stevens  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane. The sixty homes you are planning to build on that site are far too many. Sixty houses built there which will home sixty families will hugely exacerbate the problems that already exist in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction. In addition to increased traffic problems, sixty homes built there will mean extra surface water which will lead to increased flooding in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2855  Respondent: 17368705 / Reginald and Mavis Perryman  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy A42 - to the original 45 homes and the increase to 60 homes, on the basis that it is in the Green-belt and is flood-plain: and that local roads including Tannery Lane and the A247 are too narrow and the latter already severely congested. As residents of over 50 years, we know this area is prone to flooding, but also that is an area of open space close to the Wey Navigation much used by walkers both local and those visiting the area.
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery in Tannery Lane for the following reasons:

1. There has been an increase in proposed building of houses from 45 to 60 – this is ridiculously too many for our area.
2. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
3. Access to Tannery Lane at the A247 junction is not viable for the amount of traffic that will be incurred.
4. Tannery Lane itself if not capable of being used by large or numerous vehicles – it is a Lane.
5. This will be eroding even more of the Green Belt.
6. There is already bad surface water flooding in this area. This can only increase the problem.
7. This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42) The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is **33% more** and too much
- It ignores all the **hundreds of previous objections** made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2936  **Respondent:** 17373505 / Paul Beach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3012  **Respondent:** 17380161 / Nicola Banham  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
It will worsen traffic congestion in the local area which is already busy and often sees heavy traffic during and after peak hours, even when the major roads have cleared.
There is no infrastructure, (schools, roads, shops, etc.), in place or proposed, to support the increased demand that will result from this development.
It will increase the risk posed to cyclist using Tannery Lane and the surrounding roads. There is no proposal to improve cyclist’s safety on these narrow country roads that will see an increase in motor vehicle traffic. This is of particular concern to me as I transport my children to and from nursery, by bicycle, along these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3050  Respondent: 17380161 / Nicola Banham  Agent: 

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation
It will worsen traffic congestion in the local area which is already busy and often sees heavy traffic during and after peak hours, even when the major roads have cleared.
There is no infrastructure, (schools, roads, shops, etc.), in place or proposed, to support the increased demand that will result from this development.
It will increase the risk posed to cyclist using Tannery Lane and the surrounding roads. There is no proposal to improve cyclist’s safety on these narrow country roads that will see an increase in motor vehicle traffic. This is of particular concern to me as I transport my children to and from nursery, by bicycle, along these roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3039  Respondent: 17381601 / Madeleine Stevens  Agent: 

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:
The plan to build sixty homes is unacceptable. This is a 33% increase of the original amount of building on that site instead of a reduction of 33% which would at least be more realistic. Sixty houses would be far too many. Traffic problems in Tannery Lane would naturally increase and the risk of flooding would increase further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/3082  Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42):

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there are no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/3181  Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is virtually no infrastructure planning for sites A42, A43 and A44, which between them will have a serious impact on all local infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/3184  Respondent: 17399873 / Christine Costa  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42: Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane.

I object to Policy 42. Tannery Lane is a Lane in the heart of Send which is a village. Building 60 homes in place of 45 is an increase of 33% which the lanes cannot support. Send has already seen the closure of its post office and there is only one local shop that can provide grocery essentials. Not everyone has a car and the local bus service is abysmal; where will residents shop?

Tannery lane is a narrow lane and meets Send Road (A247). It is already a difficult access and further housing and an increase in traffic will only make this junction more difficult to navigate and cause increased noise for residents.
Surface water flooding is an existing issue in this area and this will worsen.

Finances should be committed to improving the problems in the village, not making them worse.

Hundreds of objections have been made to this proposal and the Council should not be ignoring its residents and voters.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3201  Respondent: 17400641 / Stuart Adair  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. I object because: this is further increase 15 homes on 45 the was previously objected to; It degrade access and increase traffic notably in Tannery Lane and at the junction to A247; This is already a busy road in the mornings and evenings and it's is a bottleneck when A3 has traffic issues, which is frequent; It eroding the Green Belt of village well beyond that which is acceptable; There is inadequate allowance for surface water flooding prevention and river flash floods; It degrades the aesthetics of yhe area which is major reason for choosing to live here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3242  Respondent: 17402529 / Emma Buswell  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane where there has been an increase from 45 homes to 60. This change takes no account of hundreds of previous objections made by local residents. The increase in numbers of homes will have a seriously detrimental effect on the traffic in the area, particularly as Tannery Lane is a small country road and should remain as such. This development is a significant erosion of the Green Belt in our area and is totally out of keeping with the rural nature and views across the River Wey Navigation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3320  Respondent: 17407681 / James Scrace  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane where there has been an increase from 45 homes to 60. This change takes no account of hundreds of previous objections made by local residents. The increase in numbers of homes will have a seriously detrimental effect on the traffic in the area, particularly as Tannery Lane is a small country road and should remain as such. This development is a significant erosion of the Green Belt in our area and is totally out of keeping with the rural nature and views across the River Wey Navigation.
I object to the increase in homes, the surrounding infrastructure and amenities available to existing residents of Send and Ripley is inadequate already, not to mention the current traffic congestion and condition of roads - the lack of council support for the conditions of these to be renewed, of which increase resulting traffic and car numbers from this increase in dwellings, will exacerbate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3358  Respondent: 17408065 / Daphne Hollett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal as anyone who lives in send who uses Tannery Lane knows the small rural lane is utterly unsuitable for further developments to take place, turning into Send Road from Tannery takes an age and is difficult to exit to send Road. You have already allowed, despite objections which I assume were again just ignored, a marina no one wanted and which we all knew was a precursor to further development requests. Not only have we been ignored but you have this time decided to INCREASE the number of houses for the site by 30 odd%. The impact on traffic, the green belt, amenities and the area itself makes this a completely wrong.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3365  Respondent: 17408225 / Jill and Arthur Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because it is a far greater development than was originally planned. It arrogantly ignores all the previous objections and will make traffic movement in Send absolutely impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3380  Respondent: 17408321 / Graham Legge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
• It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
• It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
• It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
• It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
• It will exacerbate the erosion of the green belt
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane where there has been an increase from 45 homes to 60. This change takes no account of hundreds of previous objections made by local residents. The increase in numbers of homes will have a seriously detrimental effect on the traffic in the area, particularly as Tannery Lane is a small country road and should remain as such. This development is a significant erosion of the Green Belt in our area and is totally out of keeping with the rural nature and views across the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is up by 33%, an excessive amount. It ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people. It will add to the surface water flooding that we already have a problem with. It will further alter the village becoming more urban losing more Green Belt which was to protect natural or semi natural environments and to protect unique character of rural communities. It will put pressure on the local infrastructure and worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3552  Respondent: 17416801 / Angharad Good  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously
I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much]
• It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
• It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
• It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3575  Respondent: 17417217 / Paul Good  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42 Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

• The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much] • It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction • It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse • It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse • It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3597  Respondent: 17418401 / Charles Penny  Agent:
I strongly object to the increase of houses at Clockbarn Nurseries (Site A42)

The areas around the site of A42 is not at all suitable for a further increase from 45 to 60 homes. Tannery Lane and Papercourt Lane are single track lanes for the large majority and not suitable for more cars and with the Marina the lanes will simply not be able to cope. This will push further traffic from the smaller lanes onto the A247 and Newark Lane which are already heavily under pressure especially in peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
restricted access along Tannery Lane which is narrow and for most its length only capable of providing access for cars in one direction. Development of the site is not therefore sustainable or practical. Tannery Lane already provides access to a Business Park which generates a considerable amount of traffic at all times of the day including lorries. This narrow country lane cannot cope with any more traffic. Planning consent has already been granted, rather unwise, given the access problems, for 84 flats and a marina. Anymore development at this location would not be sustainable.

The junction with Send Road has poor visibility and is dangerous for traffic entering and leaving Tannery Lane.

There is no need for housing on this site; the local plan housing target is incorrect. The figures quoted way exceed the local need; the local requirements are for social housing and not large executive boxes as favoured by developers to maximize profits.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3644</th>
<th>Respondent: 17424097 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the 33% increase in homes proposed with the change to Policy A42 at Clockburn in Tannery Lane. This increase comes despite numerous objections to the original plan for 45 houses, which has been responded to merely by increasing this number to 60. Current traffic problems and access issues in Tannery lane and at the A247 junction will be worsened by this proposal as will the current surface water flooding. Furthermore this proposal will increase the erosion of Send’s greenbelt and will have a negative impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3393</th>
<th>Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries because of inadequate access and traffic volumes ( please see below).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3680</th>
<th>Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn Nurseries because of inadequate access and traffic volumes ( please see below).
I object to the policy A42 because I wish our village to remain in the Green belt and this plan alters that situation.

The increase in homes from 45 to 60 seems like far too much for the area and it ignores all the previous objections which have been made by local people in the village.

The traffic at the Tannery Lane junction and the main road (A247) is already bad as this is a difficult junction to exit - the proposals can only make matters far worse.

This area is subject to flooding - there is a flood plain nearby. The proposal does not contain good plans for removal of surface water.

This village benefits from the Wey Navigation Canal and its open countryside is an asset. So many houses will mar the views which attract tourism on the canal to the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3712  Respondent: 17424897 / Peter Sanderson-Byrne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3715  Respondent: 17424897 / Peter Sanderson-Byrne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan".
The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3749  Respondent: 17425889 / Karen Thornton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is totally unsuitable for the amount of traffic which would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there is no sensible reason to justify building on the green belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3754  Respondent: 17426081 / Robert Yates  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction.
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse.
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse.
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3760  Respondent: 17426401 / Kate Legge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
• It ignores all the hundred of previous objections made by local people
• It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
• It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
• It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
• It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3766  Respondent: 17426593 / Darren Moss  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A42 as detailed above because:

The increase to 60 homes in place of the original 45 is more than a 33% increase and far too much for the site and it's ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by concerned local people.

It will worsen access and increase significantly the traffic issues in Tannery Lane and the A247 Junction.

It will make a erosion of the green belt in our village worse and will increase surface water flooding which is already very bad, even worse in the area.

It will also impact open countryside views from the lovely River way navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3797  Respondent: 17427713 / The Aldertons Farm Residents Company Limited  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• The increase in the number of residential units from 45 to 60 (+15) is over a 30% uplift on a relatively small site and will lead to a cramped overdevelopment and an unacceptable increase in hardstanding to accommodate the increased parking and access roads resulting in further erosion of the Green Belt.
• Tannery Lane is a narrow secondary road that in parts is almost a single track width and therefore traffic problems will be more frequent commencing with the construction of the development requiring large vehicles and plant to manoeuvre into and out of Tannery Lane.
• The junction of Tannery Lane with Send Road is very restricted and requires substantial improvement to accommodate the increased use and to provide adequate safety for both pedestrians and vehicles.
• The proposal would severely impact on the open aspect of the surrounding Green Belt and in particular the views from the River Wey Navigation.
• The increase in units now proposed by the Council completely ignores the hundreds of previous objections made by local people.
• Recent flooding issues in and around the immediate area highlight the need for a conscience approach to development and by increasing the number of residential units on this site the incidence of flooding will be increased.
• The recent approval of the planning application (14/P/02289) for the Cartbridge Traditional Narrowboat Basin on the River Wey Navigation, (construction works are now underway) already puts pressure on the Tannery Lane junctions with Polseden Lane and Send Road. Therefore the cumulative effect of both developments will result in an increase in the potential for accidents at the road junctions unless substantial highway improvements are made. Also there are over 50 parking spaces within the Cartbridge Basin application site which, together with the associated hardstanding, severely impact on the rural nature of the surrounding Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3801  Respondent: 17427777 / Valerie Ann Lazenby  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 42 for an

Increase in the number of houses. This would increase traffic In the area, and last week it took me 10 minutes just to get out of Sanger Drive onto the A 247 at lunchtime!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3824  Respondent: 17432673 / M Clark  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much

It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3863  Respondent: 17433665 / Nancy Hamilton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I also object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nurseries in Tannery Lane because of the increase in traffic this will cause and the safety of the road junctions in the village. There will be further strain in amenities such as schools, medical centres etc which are currently straining under the pressures of recent housing developments.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3897  **Respondent:** 17434049 / Lucy Starke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42)

This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states "Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays." And yet there is no proposals to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3936  **Respondent:** 17434689 / Anya Williamson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the Policy A42 change for the following reasons:

- The 33% increase from 45 to 60 homes is excessive
- Please don’t ignore hundreds of objections already made by local residents
- It will worsen traffic congestion, air pollution and dangers to residents and their families in Send, Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction. The roads are too narrow.
- It will set a precedent for further erosion of Green Belt in the village and surrounding areas

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3940  **Respondent:** 17434785 / Steve Nicoll  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3964  Respondent: 17440225 / Louisa Scott  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The plans have increased from 45 homes to 60 homes which is 33% and this is too much
- It ignores all the hundreds of previous objections made by local people
- It will increase problems with the traffic in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will cause erosion of the Green Belt in our village
- It will increase surface water flooding, which is already a problem and is increasing with further development
- It will impact on the open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3971  Respondent: 17440385 / Rob Barnes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Policy A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane

The proposed allocation for 45 homes in the previous draft plan on green belt land was objected to & I object to this revision which now proposes a 33% increase to 60 homes. Tannery Lane is unsuitable for the quantity of traffic which
would be generated, as is the junction with the A247, and there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3977  **Respondent:** 17440705 / Chris Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **POLICY A42 Pages 241-2**

I object to the proposed increase of a further 16 houses on the Clockbarn Nursery site. This is a totally unsuitable site anyway for a high density development. Increasing the number of houses completely exacerbates the situation.

Traffic movements from the site coupled with traffic accessing the new Marina development and then trying to join Send Road would cause considerable problems for residents and through-traffic alike. Access from Tannery Lane to Send Road is very limited and trying to join it, particularly at peak times, would be extremely difficult.

Send Road is already used to capacity by traffic heading to and from Junction 10 on the M25 and is used as a rat run off these roads. Send Road was never intended to be used by today’s very large articulated trucks.

The essential traffic islands to enable pedestrians to cross represent an additional hazard plus the increasing number of cyclists exposed to rising levels of exhaust pollution.

Access from the opposite end of Tannery Lane is through very narrow roads with limited passing areas which will render this access effectively impossible. This means that traffic from the Marina and the Clockbarn Nursery site would be forced to come and go via the Send Road junction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4052  **Respondent:** 17446113 / Phil Davie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane (Site No. A42)**

- **Scale of development:** I OBJECT to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because this area is acknowledged by river users as being part of one of the very few quiet stretches along the Wey Navigation. Any increase in development scale will reduce this ambience.
  - **Scale of development:** I OBJECT to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will harm the open aspect of the area and views associated with the Wey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clockbarn Nursery Tannery Lane (Site No. A42)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> pslp172/4253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Traffic Infrastructure Capacity:** **I OBJECT** to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will create additional traffic movements which existing very narrow roads and the Tannery Lane/A247 intersection cannot safely support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Policy A42</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Now 60 homes in place of 45 homes previously</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because:

- The increase to 60 homes in place of 45 homes is 33% more and too much]
- It will worsen access and traffic problems in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction
- It will make erosion of the Green Belt in our village worse
- It will make surface water flooding, which is already bad, even worse
- It will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation

| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |
| **Comment ID:** pslp172/4069 | **Respondent:** 17447329 / Justin Rowland | **Agent:** |
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |

- **Scale of development:** **I OBJECT** to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because this area is acknowledged by river users as being part of one of the very few quiet stretches along the Wey Navigation. Any increase in development scale will reduce this ambience.

- **Scale of development:** **I OBJECT** to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will harm the open aspect of the area and views associated with the Wey.

- **Traffic Infrastructure Capacity:** **I OBJECT** to the proposed increase from 45 to 60 homes because increased development in the area will create additional traffic movements which existing very narrow roads and the Tannery Lane/A247 intersection cannot safely support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed increase in the number of homes from 45 to 60 (33%) is far too great. It merely ignores the previous objections made by local residents and fails to take any account of the serious problems which will result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will greatly worsen traffic and access problems both in Tannery Lane and at the junction of that road with the A247.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will greatly increase the erosion of the Green Belt in the village. Guildford MBC appear to me to have a pre-determined agenda to build upon the Green Belt without taking into account the fact that the infrastructure existing is totally inadequate to cope with such development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently there are problems in the area so far as surface water flooding is concerned. The current proposals will increase these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation will be seriously worsened. The original purpose of Green Belt legislation was to protect the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> pslp172/4121</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 17455585 / Victor Truscott</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A42 change at Clockbarn Nursery to increase the number of homes by 33% on this site from 45 to 60 and after hundreds of previous objections which were ignored is unacceptable. Tannery Lane is a narrow lane with blind bends and cars frequently have trouble passing each other. Turning into Tannery Lane from the A247 only 5 of the 10 dwellings have off street parking and parking by residents on the road causes passing problems and at times moving their vehicles to allow for lorries to get through, this will become worse with increasing numbers of vehicles. Vehicles turning in from or exiting onto the A247 have very poor sight lines at this junction due to parked cars. The pavement in Tannery Lane itself for pedestrians is outside these homes and is in a very bad state of repair there fore it is very dangerous to walk down Tannery Lane with vehicle movements. The recent planning application for the Marina development is already adding to vehicular problems. Surface water flowing in this area is a problem and will be made worse with development and needs to be addressed. Finally the countryside and wildlife of which can be seen regularly will be hugely affected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comment ID:</strong> pslp172/4171</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 17459617 / Renaissance Classics (Keith Sohl)</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane, Send will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of
the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposal to improve the local roads; only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4225  Respondent: 17462657 / Malcom Scott  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in housing proposed in Tannery Lane (site A42) This has been increased by a third since the 2016 version of the Plan. This will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around Send. This is in contradiction to section 2.14a of the Plan which states “Whilst most local roads are single carriageway, with a lane in each direction, it is at their junctions that the free flow of traffic is most often impeded during peak periods, in some cases resulting in significant delays.” And yet there is no proposal to improve the local roads, only to add more junctions with the A3, thereby increasing congestion on the Trunk and Local road network.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4848  Respondent: 17484449 / Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)  Agent: Savills (Richard Hill)
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A42
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51756</td>
<td>A42 - Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability in relation to this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Total records: 846.
Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

Document part: A43 - Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley
### Proposed Submission Local Plan Regulation 19 representations (2016 and 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/539</th>
<th>Respondent: 8553761 / A Howlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. Insufficient thought has been given to how the local infrastructure could cope with the additional traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. The office block on the Portsmouth road at Burnt common has remained unoccupied for 10 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding, with regular flooding on Portsmouth road where the river had to be diverted and culverted at the intersection with Send Marsh Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8118</th>
<th>Respondent: 8556385 / Guildford Residents Association, EGRA (Amanda Mullarkey)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43: Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments on questions 1 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy on green approaches needs strengthening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2910</th>
<th>Respondent: 8559745 / Mr Brian East</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at Garlicks Arch. This was sprung on the village at the last moment, only 2 weeks notice and without any prior consultation.

The infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels. Our roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope. Industrial space is not needed and if it was could be accommodated on the Slyfield industrial estate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy A43: Land at Garlick’s Arch (page 221)

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods.

This was a sleight of hand by GBC in slipping this application into the Plan at such short notice. The site has never been proposed before and has not undergone a proper and full evaluation.

This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them. There is evidence suggesting a link between cancer/Leukaemia and power lines and this has not been considered.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site. Slyfield has room to expand and accommodate extra capacity and is well located on the edge of the town.

If Garlick’s Arch proceeds it will create traffic chaos in all the approach roads through the villages of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. There is simply no proven need to consider this site for industrial or housing, on any scale planned.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for deer and other wildlife. It was never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council’s ‘Issues and Options report’ or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.

In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from ‘Oldlands’ to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so how is can now be considered apt to construct 400 houses and 7,000sq.metres of employment space there?
Apart from the fact that this is all Green Belt land, the infrastructure just cannot support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just shop (Waitrose), no doctors’ surgery, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity.

Any development at all in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be to the very substantial detriment of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41%.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use. It is totally inappropriate and would destroy the village’s demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.

This very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process and therefore shall, if approved by your Council, be subject to immediate legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2479  Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 : Land at Garlick's Arch (page 221)

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods.

This was a sleight of hand by GBC in slipping this application into the Plan at such short notice. The site has never been proposed before and has not undergone a proper and full evaluation.

This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them. There is evidence suggesting a link between cancer/Leukaemia and power lines and this has not been considered.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site. Slyfield has room to expand and accommodate extra capacity and is well located on the edge of the town.

If Garlick's Arch proceeds it will create traffic chaos in all the approach roads through the villages of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. There is simply no proven need to consider this site for industrial or housing, on any scale planned.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 800;6 in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq m employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for deer and other wildlife. It was never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council's 'Issues and Options report' or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.
In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from 'Oldlands' to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so how is can now be considered apt to construct 400 houses and 7,000sq.metres of employment space there?

Apart from the fact that this is all Green Belt land, the infrastructure just cannot support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just shop (Waitrose), no doctors' surgery, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity.

Any development at all in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be to the very substantial detriment of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41%.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use. It is totally inappropriate and would destroy the village's demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.

This very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process and therefore shall, if approved by your Council, be subject to immediate legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2483  Respondent: 8561057 / Chris Brown  Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fields around Danesfield, Send Marsh (GU23 6LS)

I refer to this area because it is not currently high profile but it is a significant site for other reasons.

I wish to object to this site although it is not specifically mentioned. However, I understand this site is regarded as 'safeguarded' and therefore could come into play should some of the sites drop out.

If you look at the maps then you will see that the far end and sides of Danesfield have had their boundaries inset and now the back gardens of these houses now are the proposed greenbelt boundary. As we are surrounded by open fields then this suggests that everything the other side, ie open fields, would be redesignated as non greenbelt and therefore will be developed.

My comments on this site are as follows:

1. This site is on a flood plain. Over 37% of the site is in flood zones 2 or 3, with over 25% in flood zone. Therefore, this land is clearly not suitable for development and this was borne out whenever there is heavy rain and the land floods. I am reliably informed that the area becomes almost a large lake when there is a heavy downpour and this can be seen from the road and footpaths.

2. GBC policy and the Environment Agency are against developing on flood zones and so for this reason the land should not be built on or developed. GBC could face legal action from the Environment Agency if they were to go against this and spend tax payer's funds to defend such a claim. This would be an irresponsible use of tax payer's money.

3. I know photographic evidence showing the effect of flooding on the site have been sent to GBC and they have accordingly downgraded the site from a Potential Development Area to a Safeguarded Area.
1. Any building or hard standing will reduce the land available to absorb the run off from heavy rain falls and this will exaggerate the flooding. This could cause flooding and damage to adjoining property in Danesfield which may lead to future insurance claims.

1. There are many bats on this site which are protected under The Conservation of Habits and Species Regulations.

1. The access into the site is limited to only two points of One entry is onto the busy Send Marsh Road which is narrow and unsuitable to carry more traffic. This entry point is near to a blind bend so there would be a safety concern and a potential accident black spot with approaching traffic from the direction of Send. The other entry point is into the side of Danesfield where the access is deliberately narrow as it is a residential road where many families live with young children. There is only just enough room to get two cars passing so a massive increase in traffic would be totally impractical as well as dangerous for all the small children who play in the road. Furthermore, there is an old established oak tree on the entry point which would have to be cut down and I believe this has a TPO on it.

1. As a resident of Send for 50 years, and with my family living here and our garden backing onto this site, I am very concerned about what is being discussed regarding potential building on the site. It would be an absolute travesty if this land were to be lost to building. This corner of Send Marsh is of an open rural nature and therefore totally unsuitable for setting from the green belt.

1. Our village is loved and cherished by all those of us who live Send Marsh has a long history of generations of families living here and we all love the open countryside, the lovely walks, the beautiful views and the village life atmosphere. To commence on such a thoughtless and aggressive building program would bring this to an end and would mean that we could never go back to what we once had.

1. The site should not be termed "safe guarded" as the meaning of "safe" does not seem to As I understand the term as used here, this site could be back on the table as a possible contender for consideration for planning permission if other sites do not get their planning granted. There would not be a democratic process for this site to then have a further round of public consultation as the date will have been passed. We would then be at the mercy of GBC and the planners.

1. Send Marsh has already seen a dramatic increase in the traffic flowing through it and into Send village at peak hours with long tailbacks from the traffic lights at Mays Send Marsh regularly sees delays getting onto the Portsmouth Road at Send Dip with long queues of traffic going towards Ripley and Burnt Common.

1. This site is at the back of Danesfield has limited access onto Send Marsh Road and if this was the only way out then this would put a lot of strain onto an already congested road. If the access was through Danesfield then this would seriously congest our road as it is very narrow and difficult to pass cars at various points.

1. This site should not be removed "inset" from the green belt as this would mean planning permission would surely be granted for the

1. The field behind Danesfield is a beautiful open space with much wildlife including deer and foxes as well as lots of The field is enjoyed by those in the village who walk and take their dogs by the adjoining footpaths.

1. Send Marsh Road has a very narrow and dangerous bridge which would need to be widened to make it safer and the whole of the Send Marsh Road would need to be There is no mention of this in the plan.

1. Send Marsh does not have any infrastructure. There are no local shops, no school, no doctor's surgery and no public park. It comprises of mainly all houses and so the addition of so many new houses will put huge pressure on the infrastructure on Send and Ripley, both of which can hardly cope with the current pressures. You would have to walk a considerable distance to access any of these services and so this would mean owners would have to use a car. This would seem contrary to the governments' policy for us all being green and reducing pollution.
1. The bus routes to and from both villages are very poor and infrequent, about one per hour. Again it is essential to have a The roads are too narrow and dangerous for cyclists so this is not really an option.

1. By proposing greenbelt sites in the area means this land will be gone It is essential we protect the greenbelt or we will simply be a concrete jungle joined to Guildford and Woking with no green space in between. These greenbelt areas are essential to everyday living to provide clean and open space for everyone to enjoy.

1. There are plenty of brownfield sites available which should also be considered. In addition, there are sites which have been given planning permission but builders are refusing to build on as presumably, they are waiting for house prices to increase so they can maximise their profits. I feel time limits should be placed on planning permissions granted to encourage building in any economic climate.

1. Send Marsh is poorly served by schools, particularly the secondary. It has become increasingly difficult to get children into George Abbot which is the closest school to the village. With the amount of houses to be built set to increase, where will the children go to school if we don’t have a plan to build schools?

I would like to place on record my objections which I would like to be seen by the Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2892  Respondent: 8562145 / Mr Christopher Last  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO THE PLANS OUTLINED IN POLICY A43 on the grounds that this area is Green Belt and is therefore protected from development. It is a wildlife habitat. What does The Council propose to do about this? The brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common is large enough for the 7,000 sq. m. suggested for further development. If the Council builds on this area, the small, beautiful country villages of Ripley and Send will become suburbs of Guildford in no time at all and their uniqueness and beauty will be lost forever. Please don’t touch our Green Belt! This why we moved to this area, because it is unspoilt! I also object to the plan for 400 new homes, on the grounds that there is insufficient infrastructure to maintain this level of development, viz: health centres, schools etc. I also strongly object to the manner in which this plan was put forward at the last moment, without consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2809  Respondent: 8562273 / The Clandon Society (Christopher Dean)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

We object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
This site had been previously considered and rejected before the previous draft of the Plan. The site was then inserted in this draft only hours before its publication without any consultation. We have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

This is a cavalier approach to public engagement by the Council.

1. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

1. The site is susceptible to flooding and development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

1. The Council appears to view the development as an enabling site to obtain land and developer funding for slip roads on/off the A3. This is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking Green Belt land. The slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham school was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

1. The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

1. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7291 Respondent: 8562561 / Mrs C Sheard Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
I OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7692</th>
<th>Respondent: 8563169 / Send Parish Council (Debbie Hurdle)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This would involve loss of one of the very few remaining areas of woodland in the vicinity. Ancient woodland is irreplaceable. Much of the woodland was planted hundreds of years ago, in fact many of the oaks show great age.

400 Houses is an outrageous number for any small village to accommodate. It would virtually raise the number of residences in the villages by 25%. The implications for traffic are dramatic. Every day Portsmouth Road is stacked back from the M25 to the Send Road traffic lights from 8.00am to about 9.15am and then the flow is reversed in the evening. There is serious concern about air pollution from the cars that sit in the roads with engines running. The access to the Portsmouth road is poor from the proposed development. It is very near to the Burnt Common Lane junction.

The addition of the industrial buildings so close to housing is undesirable and perfectly good sites are available at Slyfield Industrial area. There are also electric pylons on this land which must be addressed in the event of development.

This Garlick’s Arch site abuts the East Clandon Stream. The stream frequently floods onto the Portsmouth Road and the A3. Furthermore, with so many buildings being added the run off the land onto the stream will be aggravated. We understand that the site is built on London Clay. This means that every time there is the potential for the stream to rise, the land floods. (see attached photograph) In addition the trees that are being removed will also exacerbate the problem. The copse is home to and regular visiting place for deer, foxes, owls, bats, rabbits, hares not to mention having a carpet of bluebells in spring.

Much of the Garlick’s Arch area is used for country pursuits in varying ways. The large field abutting Burnt Common Lane is still farmed which is rare in the borough. Pheasants are raised in this and the adjoining wooded area. There is a Clay pigeon shooting syndicate which use the land to the end of Kiln Lane. Dog walkers are regular users of the lanes and surrounding fields.

We understand from the Guildford Lead Councillor for Infrastructure, Matt Furniss, that the 400 houses proposed is the pay back required by the landowner for the land gift being offered for the four way junction to the A3. We are of the opinion that the payment is disproportionate to the benefit for our Village.

The infrastructure needs to be in place before the site is considered for development because the pressure on the current roads is too great. Parking in the village is already stretched. There is no bus service at all to the Villages Medical Centre which is already oversubscribed.

The large field mentioned in this application was subject to a planning application for 25 houses on the Oatlands side site a couple of years ago but was turned down but yet here it is again with a suggestion of 400 houses this time.

In a more recent planning application for the land at Oldlands Field Yard which is adjacent to this current development, permission was refused by Guildford Borough Council and the following two extracts are from the letter of refusal. Surely the same reasons would apply to the land now proposed for 400 houses and an industrial development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The parish council made objections to the site at Garlick’s Arch in 2016, and the objection to the residential element is maintained.

The changes introduce a provision for travelling showpeople into this allocation. Policy H1 provides the strategic policy for the provision of plots for travelling showpeople and seeks to secure such plots where provision is being made for 500 homes or more. Garlick’s Arch is proposed for only 400 homes, and the parish council therefore question the suitability of the site to accommodate such plots. Whilst there is no detail of how these sites might be accessed, neither Burnt Common Lane nor Kiln Lane are suitable for the sort of vehicles that might be expected at such plots.

The changes to policy H1, sub-section (6), remove reference to the impact upon the visual amenity of such provisions. The parish council would wish this wording to remain. Whilst the site allocation text introduces reference to visual amenity in para (7) of policy A43, this is not felt to be equivalent to the wording lost from H1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Vehicles in the area using the local roads. We hardly need industrial buildings, as past developments have stood empty for years.

I OBJECT TO site A43A the on and off ramp at Clandon/Burnt Common. This will cause complete chaos in the area, as all roads leading to the junction are country roads leading from Clandon, Ripley and Send. At present it only takes an incident at Wisley /Junction 10 of the M25 and our villages are swamped with traffic. This junction will make the whole situation worse as the local roads are so narrow and are unable to be widened to suit increased traffic flow. The Send Road only leads to similar narrow roads in Old Woking and Hoebridge areas, which are also unable to be widened.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1798</th>
<th>Respondent: 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the proposals for housing and semi-industrial buildings at the Garlick's Arch site, which is for a large number of houses which would generate heavy overload of the local social infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3591</th>
<th>Respondent: 8566049 / Mr David W Lazenby</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A 43, for an absurd increase in housing provision at Garlick’s Arch, now proposed to be for 400 houses, including 6 travellers’ sites. No justification has been provided for this huge increase. It would swamp the local roads and public services. The main road through Send, being the main route from Woking to the South is already overloaded with queues of up to 1 mile at morning and evening peaks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8277</th>
<th>Respondent: 8566497 / Derek Horne &amp; Associates Ltd (Derek Horne)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43, Land at Garlick's Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a rural Green Belt site unrelated to any significant development and remote from shops and public transport. It is an unsustainable site on which unsustainable development is proposed contrary to government advice as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. If such a scale of development is necessary, which is disputed, there are several much better sites in the area that should be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1451  Respondent: 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. Development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4528  Respondent: 8568193 / Miss Edwina Attwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/266  **Respondent:** 8568673 / Enid Morgan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )**

This is green belt. It is not suitable for industrial development. The A247 cannot handle the present traffic load let alone an increase in the number of larger forms of transport. The local infrastructure and services cannot handle another 400 homes, the schools, doctors and all other services are already overloaded in this area. Please think again as this area is not suitable for this plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/424  **Respondent:** 8569729 / Eric Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **Policy A 43.30 Land at Garlick’s Arch: I object** This is a NEW INCLUSION and whilst I see some merit in improving A3 access the effect on Send and the A 247, which cannot be sufficiently improved, would be likely to create gridlock! This doesn't seem to have been thought through! Garlick's Arch is again a massive incursion into the green belt to which I object. This seems to have replaced the Burnt Common site which would have had less impact on the area and I understand is classified as a brown field site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4161  **Respondent:** 8570273 / Fiona Curtis  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

A43 Garlicks Arch

The stated, albeit unproven, need by GBC is 400 homes. Normal residential density is 30 homes per ha. Land required would therefore be 13 ha. Land actually proposed to be allocated is 28.9 ha. This is more than double land required in beautiful irreplaceable Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6003  Respondent: 8570593 / John Newman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

On reviewing the proposed local plan, I object to Policy 43 - land at Garlick's Arch.

The land suffers from being a Flood Zone, I understand it is Zone 3. Looking at recent flooding I consider this should be reviewed. There are electric pylons on the site which would put development into the second five year period. The site has Ancient Woodland dating back to the 16th Century!

The addition of 400 new home is a major increase in the local population is this wise?

The need for schools, Doctors surgeries, transportation and with only one shop in the locality.

At the last meeting the Garlick's Arch replaced the Burnt Common Nurseries site which had been in since the beginning had been thoroughly reviewed. The site already has three industrial units totalling 5000 square metres and is logical to extend. The proposal is for small industrial units to met the local requirements.

The site can also handle 100 new houses which would not put undue pressure on local facilities.

Policy A43a - Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 is dependent on the owners of Garlick's Arch gifting the land for the slip road on condition of receiving planning permission for housing. Use of slip roads will have a severe impact on the population of Wisley, Send, the Clandon's and other local populations.

The decision was made before they built the Wisley bypass not to have slip roads to/ from A3. With the increase in traffic why should this have changed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2758  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to the very poor vehicular access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2759  Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7582</th>
<th>Respondent: 8571137 / G Mansbridge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. mtrs. of industrial space at Garlick's Arch due to the destruction of very ancient woodland and adding to the area flood risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4302</th>
<th>Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 45 houses at Clockbarn Nursery due to the very poor vehicular access.

I OBJECT to your plan for the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. mtrs. of industrial space at Garlick's Arch due to the destruction of very ancient woodland and adding to the area flood risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3493</th>
<th>Respondent: 8573793 / Harry Eve</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch

191. I object to this site being included. The inclusion of this site is a major change from the previous draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is a large development that was not included in the strategic highway assessment. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt.

192. Ancient woodland will be put at risk and, strangely, the "opportunities" include "Green Corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the site" when the proposal represents a major reduction in these features.

193. The site is unsustainable as its location will generate a large volume of car journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the continued inclusion of this site despite the many issues raised in the consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3785  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch being brought forward as a last minute proposal without any warning and without it having been mentioned at all in the earlier Draft Local. This attempt to push it through under Regulation 19 instead of Regulation 18 and thereby deny residents a proper process of consultation is a further manifestation of the contempt in which Guildford Councillors hold the electorate. This is a clear breach of administrative law.

2. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch because the site includes ancient woodland, too valuable to The site floods as photographic evidence and local testimony can confirm as a result of the East Clandon stream overflowing and surface water being trapped.

3. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch since this would increase the number of dwellings in Send (including Send Marsh and Burnt Common) by about 25% without a commensurate increase in services and infrastructure. There is already severe pressure on doctors surgeries, school places and other essential facilities which would seriously worsen. Infrastructure issues are substantially the responsibility of Surrey County Council but there is no evidence that SCC has formulated an infrastructure plan, or the means by which the infrastructure would be paid for, in respect of this site or any other site. What we were told at one public meeting, that the council thinks about infrastructure afterwards, is typical of a woefully inadequate approach to the whole Local Plan.

4. I OBJECT to 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch because the space is not needed since there is inadequate take up of existing space in the area, but if it were needed it would make very much more sense to locate it at In any event Garlick's Arch is an unsuitable location for industrial space given the proximity of existing houses.

5. I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm as well as 485 from Send itself. This is in addition to what it takes at the moment. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would face gridlock. This would exacerbate noise and pollution levels which are already excessive and is wholly unacceptable.

6. I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because it is being presented as a way of facilitating the movement of a massive increase in vehicles whereas in reality it would cause havoc on the A247 and the many feeder roads in Ripley and Clandon in addition to Send.

7. I OBJECT to the fact that Guildford Councillors approved the Local Plan before the Transport Assessment had even been published which indicates what scant regard they had for the traffic implications which are at the forefront of residents’ They have to contend with the problem every day in terms of delays, pollution and noise which are already destroying our villages as decent places in which to live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1572  Respondent: 8574369 / Douglas French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because it is beautiful permanent Green Belt land which will be spoilt by the building of 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt land. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years. The local roads around Send and Ripley will be overwhelmed by the traffic generated by this development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh Policy A43

Now 6 travelling show people plots in addition to 400 houses

5.1 I object because there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location and GBC has produced no tangible evidence to support their claim that there is. Such a site needs to have parking and turning for lorries and trailers, a service and cleaning area, on site storage and accommodation for show people and their families. Access for this from Kiln Lane or Burnt Common Lane would be very difficult, if not impossible.

5.2 By objecting to this, which I am permitted to do under Regulation 19, I am not implying that I prefer what was proposed before. I do not favour any development at Garlick’s Arch for all the reasons given.

5.3 I object to the policy change at Garlicks’ Arch which now includes some custom and self-build accommodation because:

5.4 The site is contaminated by lead shot which cannot easily be cleaned up because it has accumulated over 50 years

5.5 It is subject to frequent flooding (for which photographic evidence can be provided) and is in flood zone 2 making it an unsafe and unsuitable site choice.

5.6 It ignores the thousands of objections made previously to the previous proposals.

5.7 It is permanent Green Belt Land and no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.

5.8 It would destroy ancient woodland dating back to the time of Elizabeth 1

5.9 The site is not near any public transport so residents would be obliged to rely on their cars.

5.10 There are six rural businesses currently on the site and I object to the destruction of rural employment which would result from GBC’s proposals.

5.11 It passes belief that in the whole of Guildford Borough this inaccessible, contaminated, ancient woodland site in the Green Belt, largely unserved by public transport, is the best location that can be found for houses and travelling show people plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2675  Respondent: 8575585 / Ian Macpherson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 : Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common

As this is Green Belt of high significance, any proposal here will need special justification and be wholly screened from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1655  Respondent: 8575649 / Ian Reeves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to the latest Guilford Local Plan which is not sustainable. In particular I object to:

The late inclusion of the site A43 Garlick's Arch opposite the Send Marsh Road. This is a Green Belt area covered by ancient woodland and prone to flooding. The industrial space planned of 7,000 sq. metres is not needed and mis-placed. If it were needed it should be at Slyfield. In addition the need to build 400 houses on this site is based on dubious calculations which the Council have refused to disclose. With proper use of Brownfield sites the building on this Green Belt site is not needed. There are no exceptional circumstances to build on this or any other Green Belt site in this area. Furthermore, these houses will generate more traffic for our already over busy roads and place even more pressure on local services such as Doctors and Schools especially with the other very large local developments included in the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2457  Respondent: 8575649 / Ian Reeves  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks's because:- It ignores my and thousands of other previous objections made by the local population.

How can you justify the need for Travelling Showpeople plots here?

This is Green Belt and Ancient woodland and no 'Exceptional Circumstances' exist.

It is over development of our villages and number of homes is excessive.

This will exacerbate the already problem of flooding in this location.
It will severely add to the already congested roads of Send and Ripley.

Furthermore I understand that it is contaminated with lead shot.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/161  **Respondent:** 8577729 / Ripley Court Educational Trust (Mr Andrew Gough)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the Garlick’s Arch plan to put 400 homes on a delicate site at the west of Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/573  **Respondent:** 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough. Garlick's Arch site at Burnt Common for at least 400 homes and an industrial site. I understand that this land was turned down earlier for a site for 25 homes as unsuitable. How can it now sustain 400. This land is an area of great natural beauty and is home to deer, badgers, many variety of birds and rare flora and fauna.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1856  **Respondent:** 8579233 / Mrs Purrett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

3. POLICY A 43— Garlick's Arch.
This policy would increase the population of the Send Marsh/Burnt common vilage by 49% and completely destroy its rural character. The new policy adds 8 travelling/show people pitches to this development making it even more inappropriate for the area. How can the Council incorporate this Policy into the plan when less than 3 years ago it refused a planning application from "Oldlands" to build only 25 houses in the same location. How can it then insist it that it applies consistent and good practice.

I therefore object to the revised proposal as:
* the village has no shops or infrastructure to support this development.
* there would be considerable additional extra traffic onto roads already congested throughout the villages olof Send,
Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley.
* no exceptional circumstances have been informed to us that would exist to destroy this Green Belt area or the area of ancient woodlands.
* No proven demand has been shown for travelling/show people pitches in this area
* it would completely destroy the rural character of the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8329  Respondent: 8581089 / Jenny Wicks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 and 43A

I object to these policies

These sites are remote from transport links except the A3, so the business activity and the residential units will add to the traffic on this congested route. Traffic from Woking which currently finds a number of different ways to access the A3 and M25 will now all be channelled through the unsuitable narrow road through Send to Burnt Common which already has long queues in the rush hour, which will be exacerbated when the new primary school building, which has its entrance on this road, is completed soon. Similarly traffic from Albury, Shere and Gomshall, Chilworth and Shalford will now be channelled along the A247 through West Clandon to access the A3 at Burnt Common. The A247 is a most unsuitable narrow road for heavy traffic, too narrow in places for two wide vehicles like HGVs to pass each other without routinely mounting the narrow pavement which runs on one side of the road only. Pedestrians have to cross and re-cross the road as the footpath is not continuous on one side of the road.

These sites were introduced at a late stage (Regulation 19) as a very late addition to the draft plan. This does not accord with para 155 of the NPPF which requires ‘early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods…………A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged’. This clearly did not happen in relation to these sites.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1236  Respondent: 8581345 / Gillian Leggatt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My objection is to the density of housing and employment use planned for this site. The traffic generated by the proposed buildings will enormously increase the present congestion in this area and in the village of Ripley where parking space is at a premium. Traffic on narrow roads in the surrounding area, already used as 'rat runs' will increase, and there will be great pressure on the local schools and doctor's surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
This site has appeared only at Reg. 19 stage. It was not been disclosed previously at Reg. 18. There has been little time to assess and comment on this proposal. In fact the Policy simply offers Green Belt land for ‘development’ which could mean, if accepted, anything from a sewage farm, refuse tip, office buildings, housing, warehousing with vast numbers of HGV’s onto a B road to even a scrap yard.

The policy is so ‘open’ and ‘vague’ it simply cannot be judged on its merits. It is currently open land which also happens to be Green Belt land. No mention of this is included in the Policy. It is of major concern that it is extremely close to the Policy A25 site (Gosden Hill), also Green Belt land. The removal of both sites from the Green Belt destroys the very basic principles of the Green Belt purpose by permitting ribbon development alongside the A3.

Thus the inclusion of this site is unsound as it destroys Green Belt principles of openness and separation of communities.

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1776  **Respondent:** 8581729 / Jeffrey Gargan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.**

*Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show people plots*

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It is permanent green belt and no exceptional circumstances exist
- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3189  Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods. This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and where there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2897  Respondent: 8586017 / Leslie Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 Pages243-5
I object to the proposed changes to this site which in combination would generate - considerable activity in a most unsuitable location. Show people pitches implies large vehicle traffic movements and a further extension to the commercial premises that have already been added on that side of the road all of which is located in close proximity to the surrounding residential area. In any case the proposed Show people sites contravenes your own guidelines of two pitches on developments of 500 to 1999 houses.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
| 1. | I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches |
| 2. | It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people |
| 3. | There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location |
| 4. | There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. |
| 5. | The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required. |
| 6. | This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it. |
| 7. | The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. |
| 8. | Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided. |
| 9. | The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result. |
| 10. | I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached. |
| 11. | I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site. |
| 12. | I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises. |
| 13. | I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. |
| 14. | I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. |
| 15. | Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. |
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT

To the building of 400 houses At Garlicks’ s Arch , this is a large Greenbelt area, flood area , there are more appropriate brownfield sites near Slyfield which could be used. Many good trees will be cut down.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8223  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial Space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. This is Green Belt Land with Ancient Woodland, and is prone to considerable flooding. The industrial space is definitely not needed as there is adequate space at Slyfield Green, and the owners at Slyfield are keen to have extra use there if there is in fact a need at all for extra industrial Space.

If GBC used the brownfield sites this Green Belt land would not be needed.

The gridlock that this development would cause on the local Roads would be

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3700  Respondent: 8589953 / Michael R. Murphy  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY A 43 because:

It ignores thousands of previous objections made by us local people.

It will cause even more traffic congestion, which is dreadful already, gridlocking the Roads in and out of Send and Ripley.

It will fill in the gap between Send Marsh and Ripley, so defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.

It will cause over development of our village and this number of homes is excessive.

There are NO "exceptional circumstances" existing to use our precious , beautiful Green Belt Land.

The beautiful Ancient Woodland in this site has been there since Elizabeth the First and must be protected for future generations.
Being a flood zone 2 allocation it is prone to frequent flooding, so the surface water will be moved onto the lower ground where I live.

There is a clay pigeon shooting site here which has polluted the ground with lead shot for over 50 years.

There is NO PROVEN demand for Traveling Show people plots here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2940  **Respondent:** 8590753 / Mr Michael Anning  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8290  **Respondent:** 8591041 / Surrey Wildlife Trust (Mike Waite)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Within BOA R04 River Wey & tributaries (includes the section of the Clandon Stream); any development here should be scaled appropriate to environmental constraints and assist achievement of BOA objectives (inc. protection, restoration & creation of Priority habitats, esp. Wet woodland, Meadows and wetland habitats). The site supports Ancient woodland, and there is also possible interest for locally rare protected species. The Trust reserves further representation pending resolution of potentially irreconcilable tensions here.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/581  **Respondent:** 8591169 / Michael Bruton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
x. Site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) – I object to this site for housing which would result in a loss of ancient woodland and impact adversely on the local infrastructure. It is too near to the congested A3 and will suffer from air pollution.

y. I object to the proposed SANG at Long Reach West Horsley as it would be used to support over 1000 additional homes in this small village.

z. I object to all proposed sites in West Horsley in excess of 5 homes. If approved there will be urban sprawl contrary to Green Belt protection – and a merging with all surrounding villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7196  Respondent: 8591521 / Mark Daniell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43. This will place a strain on local services including schools, doctors, roads and hospitals. We have not the infrastructure to support such an increase in road traffic. Send is regularly over stretched by busy traffic with queues of traffic a very common problem.

Additionally I object to the use of country side to be used for the proposed development. This will threaten natural habitats.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/407  Respondent: 8594721 / Mr Peter Eperon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development of the above sites for the following reasons:

1. Development of this area is totally inappropriate because Send and Ripley could not absorb 400 house and 7000 square feet of industrial usage. As your plan does not include any infrastructure improvements it is obvious that at most time the traffic will be become completely gridlocked. This does not take into consideration the proposed 4000 properties at Wisley and Gosden Hill Farm. The suggested four way entrances on to the A3 would also make a further impact on the area and would encourage traffic to and from Woking and Old Woking to use Send Road to reach this junction. Unless there is vast improvement to the infrastructure, e.g. shops, doctors, hospitals, dentists, schools - all of which are already over subscribed - where are all the people's facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2543  Respondent: 8595905 / Mrs Jane Whatley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan to build industrial units and housing at Garlick's Arch; this is surplus to requirements and has been added on top of proposals that have previously been put forward.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3004  Respondent: 8595905 / Mrs Jane Whatley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 citing the building of 400 homes on the Garlick's Arch site as there is no proof these homes are actually required - indeed I understand there has been a reduction in housing numbers in the Borough - and it is a beautiful area of Green Belt with no exceptional circumstances to make this proposal tenable. Local residents were extremely vocal in their previous objections to this site and with other local developments also planned there can be no proven need for the number of homes suggested in this location. It is a crime to deprive our descendants of the right to enjoy the Green Belt as we have done in our lives so far, and there are absolutely NO exceptional circumstances that would EVER make that right here. Nothing has changed, other than the Borough's seeming determination to destroy as much Green Belt as they can by handing it over to developers who will fail, as per most other large developments across the country, to meet any promised requirements for affordable housing, or the provision of services, claiming 'poverty' when it comes to any actual build. Experience shows they will only build what they can make most out of, and the rest of the population pays for their profits in terms of a lost quality of life and place a huge burden on what are effectively still semi-rural services (water, drainage electricity supplies etc). Surely you are required by Law to make sure the infrastructure is in place PRIOR to such large-scale building proposals.

We have complained previously that our village would be completely overwhelmed by such an enormous and sudden increase of people and cars; the newly built school and stretched doctors' surgery could not cope with the extra demand. Local buses and trains are not the best service, and thus most would intend to travel by car, increasing traffic at all times, but at peak times to a level that would become unbearable. Should the village become busier than currently, and living on Potters Lane, where we have recently been operating a Speedwatch campaign we have seen 1000 drivers breaking the speed limit, this sort of practice is bound to increase along all smaller back roads that are not built for such traffic. Pedestrians are in danger now, let alone when there are thousands more vehicles trying to pass through and around the village, and accidents will occur more often.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Showpeople's plots at the same site (Garlick's Arch) as there is no proven demand for these, and the disproportionate allocation to the Send area is without foundation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8249  Respondent: 8596609 / Penelope Lyons  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I object to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 m sq of industrial use and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. There is no need for any more houses on top of those already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPFF which prevents merging of the settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has particular conservation sensitivity as it is covered in ancient woodland. The proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous plan. If there is a further need for industrial space, then it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would put substantial pressure on the already overloaded Send Road (A247) as it would be the through route for Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3 and the proposed new houses at Wisley and Burpham.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/794  Respondent: 8597761 / Mrs Pippa Fleming  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the Latest Employment Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2391  Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the Latest Employment Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch (including the potential of an increase from 400 houses) because:

- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It will generate serious traffic problems at peak times that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley. We already have serious tailbacks for example on the T junction where Send Marsh Road meets Portsmouth Road
- It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The housing targets for the area are unrealistic. If they can only be achieved by erosion of the green belt, then they should not be enforced. The government is imposing these targets whilst at the same time claiming to want to protect the Green Belt. This is highly contradictory and very disappointing for the standards we should expect in this country.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2394  Respondent: 8598785 / Mr Roger Parslow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

- The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

- I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2282  Respondent: 8600929 / Roger Newland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 – I object to this policy as -

1. The changes to the current village boundary to create Garlic's Arch are only minor so this housing proposal remains disproportionate and unacceptable.
2. Changes to Garlic's Arch boundary do not address the impact on the infrastructure around Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Send.
3. The development would have a negative impact on the green belt, the ancient woodland, natural water courses and will have a negative effect on the whole area effectively doubling the size of Send Marsh. The proposed access points to the A3 at Burnt Common takes no account of the impact on the immediately surrounding road
network nor the local infrastructure. The junctions will only serve to congest the whole area rather than relieve it and as such can not be seen as a benefit to justify further development.

4. The Garlic's Arch changes do not address the gross over development of the Send Marsh area on a green field site that is an environmentally unsuitable area so close to the A3. As such the site remains unsustainable.

v. There are no special circumstances that justify the loss of this green belt.

1. The provision of traveler/showperson pitches is inappropriate and will be abused. Better to associate the minimum number to an industrial area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/883  Respondent: 8601121 / Roger Collett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (Yes), is Sound? (Yes), is Legally Compliant? (Yes)

This comment also relates to proposal A43a. While I have no objection to the proposal, which makes a significant contribution to the required housing total, I am disappointed that there is no recognition either here or in the more general documents, of the proximity of Woking, and particularly the Rail Station. There is understandable concern about the generation of increased traffic on the A247 from both increase in housing and the new slip roads. As was pointed out at the consultative meeting, it is difficult to see how the A247 can be improved, even with the sum of money allocated, to meet this demand. Can there not be more imaginative solutions, in conjunction with Woking Borough Council and Railtrack, leading to

- safe (i.e separated from vehicles) cycle routes through Send and;
- a park and ride facility to the west of Burnt Common roundabout, on land previously suggested for light industrial and housing?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7026  Respondent: 8601601 / Mr Roy Dyer  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the plans for building houses and industrial units on the Green Belt land at Garlicks Arch.
Ripley does not have the facilities needed to cope with 400 additional homes. We don’t have sufficient schools, there is already a serious lack of car parking in the village and despite the plans for the new slip road on to the A3 at Burnt Common, this will increase the traffic through the village in the long term.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/847  **Respondent:** 8604481 / Mr Steve Minter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

In regard to the final consultation of the Local Plan 2017 I have a number of detailed comments and objections listed below but first I’d like to make three general points. Firstly, our local MP, Sir Paul Beresford, has been re-elected in part on his commitment to the preservation of the Green Belt as expressed in his response to the draft last year and yet, you as a Council, have chosen to ignore not only that but also the views of many many people. You may be trying to play a game by insetting from the Green Belt first and so claiming that any subsequent building is not on the Green Belt, but that is frankly dishonest. Secondly at a time when your overall target homes numbers have reduced you have chosen to increase the allocation to Send in this version of the plan. Thirdly, the central government planning guidance against which your Local Plan should have been prepared includes the following:

"Local planning authorities should seek opportunities to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, and net gains across all three. Significant adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued." (my emphasis)

The final Plan you have now created, especially in regard to my first two points and my objections below, has significant adverse impacts in respect of at least two of these (social and environmental) and is highly questionable on the third (economic).

I object to the policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

(a) It is beautiful Permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
(b) It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
(c) It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
(d) It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt
(e) It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the roads of Send and Ripley
(f) It ignores the thousands of previous objections

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/536  **Respondent:** 8606081 / Susan Greenman  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

---

Section page number  Page 37 of 1552  Document page number  586
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I strongly object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch as it ignores all previous objections from thousands of local people.

There is no proven need for plots for "Travelling Showpeople". The shear title of these people indicates they should be "travelling" and therefore do not need a permanent plot. The title is misleading - they are not "show people" which indicates some sort of Circus. Circus people keep moving. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

This area is a permanent Green Belt site and there are absolutely no "exceptional circumstances" for this Policy.

The Policy Plan will cause over development of our Village and the number of homes is excessive.

Once again 400 homes will amount to another six to eight hundred cars on the local roads. roads are at virtual grid lock now at peak periods.

This Plan will virtually join Ripley and Send villages thus doing away with the Green Belt. The ancient woodland of this area has existed since the 15th Century and the reign of Elizabeth 1st.

The area is also subject to frequent flooding and is currently in a flood zone 2 allocation. Is this to be ignored as well as the Conservative promise of not building on Green Belt.

The land is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years. That entering the water table is a potential health hazard.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7929  Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch & Guildford District (Tim Harrold)

Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

CPRE OBJECTION TO SITES RELATING TO POLICIES A43 & A43a : GARLICK’S ARCH, SEND MARSH BURNT COMMON & RIPLEY

The proposal regarding Garlick’s Arch was only submitted at a very late stage just before the consultation on the draft Local Plan began. It therefore needs to be considered under Regulation 18 rather than Regulation 19 rules.

It appears that an as yet unspecified developer has offered a new North facing slip road with access to the A3 in exchange for approval in principle to build at least 400 homes and an industrial estate on Green Belt land adjacent to this strategic highway for which Highways England are responsible. CPRE considers that a greater degree of transparency is required for this proposal to be assessed properly. It would for example be valuable to know when and how this offer has materialised and whether it is linked in any way with any other current proposal being considered in this locality in connection with the draft local plan.

It seems to us that this application has to be considered alongside several other development proposals which involve the A3 and depend on Highways Agency overview and agreement. These include the Wisley Airfield site (A35) for 2000
homes, which was unanimously refused by GBC at an earlier date before the draft local plan was available, the Gosden Hill site at Clandon/Burpham (A25) for 2,200 houses, the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (A24) for 1,000 houses, and the Blackwell Farm site (A26) with its A3 and A31 access at the Hogs Back for 1,800 homes. The common element to all these applications is that they depend on the input of the Highways Agency.

Additionally, we should bear in mind that the Royal Horticultural Gardens at Wisley, which is one of the largest tourist attractions in this part of England, have announced their plans to expand visitor attendance from 940,000 to 1,400,000 in the years ahead which will be a further A3 traffic consideration that needs to be addressed. Without clarification from the Highways Agency as to how they intend to improve the traffic flow on the A3, which is already badly affected by peak hours congestion, and manage its various junctions with the M25, the B2251, the B2039, the A247, the A3100 and the A31 in particular, further assessment is premature. Altogether over 7,000 houses are involved which seem certain to cause not only a crippling extra traffic burden for the A3 but also for our local road network.

It is not clear as yet how a 3 or 4 way on/off ramp at Burnt Common would work. It seems unlikely that it would alleviate traffic damage on a major scale for Clandon, Send or Ripley. CPRE therefore objects to this proposal which involves the loss of Green Belt to housing development, and is therefore directly against the Minister’s statement that this would not be acceptable if local people were opposed to this and considered it inappropriate. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE further argues that it would be premature to include this proposal in the draft local plan as the overall implications of what is being considered are insufficiently described.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3885  Respondent: 8607169 / CPRE Surrey Branch & Guildford District (Tim Harrold)  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

CPRE has to point out that these applications were added late to this consultation and are only now being considered for the first time.

Garlick’s Arch and Burnt Common are within the Green Belt and both sites adjoin the A3. If progressed, these proposals would amount to urban sprawl and objectionable linear development.

The 400 houses proposed at Garlick’s Arch involves the loss of Ancient Woodland and would be subject to flooding. The communities at Ripley, Send and West Clandon would all suffer from increased traffic congestion as a result and the rural identity of these villages would be substantially harmed.

CPRE is concerned at the way in which provision is made for Travelling Show people at this site when it is clearly still uncertain as to whether the proposal will advance further. It has been suggested that this development depends on financial support from the developer at the former Wisley Airfield whose planning application was refused unanimously by the GBC Planning Committee and is now the subject of an Appeal in September. CPRE considers it premature to make any proposed development decision at Garlick’s Arch before the Appeal decision is known.

It is also premature to take these policies further before the Highway England plans for the A3 are known. It is only then that it can be reviewed whether “exceptional circumstances” would apply to justify the housing proposed and the provision of the Travelling Show People site on Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch is at risk of flooding and is classified by the Environment Agency as being at higher risk than the Council’s assessment. I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding (Policy P4). The original plan had included land at Burnt Common where there was a brownfield site this new site is absolutely wrong as it has ancient woodland and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover this site.(A43)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

We object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

We have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham school was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4796  **Respondent:** 8640353 / Julian Cranwell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**We object** to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result. We object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached. We object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well, we are aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site. We object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available. We object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises. We object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. We object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many
of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. We have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse. We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2374  Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4705</th>
<th>Respondent: 8655233 / Kay Mackay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Although this land is not particularly desirable, being alongside the A3, it does contain important woodland that should be preserved and conserved as a wild life habitat. Some high density small homes could be built on the boundary of the current housing line. Any thoughts about commercial, light industrial or stage facilities are entirely inappropriate and would bring nothing to benefit the local community. Anyone employed there would need to travel in by car. There is no sense of sustainability in planning for this kind of industrial development. If homes are needed some could be built here, but not unwanted and unnecessary industrial units.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2296  Respondent: 8667713 / Victoria Sinnett  Agent: 

20.POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a humpbacked bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which
forces pedestrians to cross and recross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1551  Respondent: 8703585 / N J Axten  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/890  Respondent: 8703937 / Alan Sussex  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 and to the inclusion of the 30 hectares of Garlick's Arch in this Plan. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft, and has not been consulted on previously and is therefore improperly included.

Even so it forms part of the Green Belt and is permanently protected by the NPPF, which is there to prevent the merging of settlements. It also contains around 5 hectares of ancient woodland, some of which dates back to the 16th century.

Furthermore any further industrial space required could easily be accommodated at Slyfield.

However, the traffic chaos that this proposal will generate is the reason for my next objection;

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1880  Respondent: 8704417 / Philip Ashfield  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I very strongly object to the draft local plan for many reasons – and I wonder if any of the Councillors have really considered this proposal, and many others in the neighbourhood –Over 600 houses in Horsleys, 400 in Burnt
Common, 2000 houses on Gosden Hill Farm (Burpham) plus a number of smaller sites in nearby villages. These add up to in excess of 5000 new dwellings in this neighbourhood.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6890  **Respondent:** 8708545 / Nigel Wicks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The site was inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the draft without proper consultation. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

Taken together with the development of the Gosden Hill site, the outcome would be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would do great environmental damage to local communities. There is no significant requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north. The addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this proposal.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4360</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8709249 / Geoff Spink</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7711  **Respondent:** 8717921 / Helen Jefferies  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation at Garlick’s Arch – allocation A43 due to the loss of ancient woodland; the impact on all local infrastructure of another 400 houses; the site is too close to the A3 and will have poor air There appears to be no joined up thinking on the various on/off junctions on the A3 – my understanding is that the SRN is meant to be for THROUGH TRAFFIC not local traffic. Numerous junctions will slow progress for all users and increase accidents due to more lane changes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1571  **Respondent:** 8726529 / Eric Palmer  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1284  **Respondent:** 8726529 / Eric Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Ref: A43 - The building of 400 homes at Garlicks Arch along with travellers show plots which will exacerbate further the traffic issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/511  **Respondent:** 8727425 / Chris Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. I have cycled to work from Ripley to Camberley for over 25 years and in this time the volume of traffic has increased massively. If we are serious about the environment and wish to encourage more people to give up the car then we must resist further development and erosion of the green belt. Our road system simply cannot cope.

2. I object to the exaggerated “housing need” figure of 13,860 which is far too high and results in the completely unnecessary development of the Green Belt. The way students, economic need and affordability are calculated inflates the housing need. No assessment is presented which projects the pull factor this scale of development will have to people already living in London. Living to so close to one of the largest cities in the world Guildford will just act as London overspill - what % of this figure is overspill - 80%?

3. I object to all proposals to build on the Green Belt at Send and elsewhere in the borough because all the actual development that is really needed for locals not London overspill can be accommodated in Guildford’s urban brownfield areas much closer to existing transport hubs.

4. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. As a Cyclist using this road every day I am seriously concerned about pollution and safety on this road. It will just become a major cut through to/from Woking with traffic from the clockwise M25 using this instead of the M25 J11. Old Woking is grid locked as it is - no account of the development by Woking Borough Council in and around this area is considered which has already increased congestion i.e. the massive development at Willow Reach (nr Woking Football Ground).

5. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also
subject to flooding. It also proved a natural barrier from the A3 reducing pollution and traffic noise. So very few sites of ancient woodland remain and this should be preserved at all costs.

6. I object to the proposed massive development at of 2,000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2,000 houses at Gosden Hill and 1,850 houses at Blackwell Farm because it will destroy large areas of Green Belt and agricultural land and the local infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing levels. Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1211  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This is a new site which has been added to this version of the Local Plan at the last minute.

OBJECT, Site is Greenbelt and should be protected.

OBJECT. Traffic in Send is Gridlocked every morning.

OBJECT, no sufficient school or doctor spaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2583  Respondent: 8729313 / Lisa Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this huge land parcel of 29 Hectares, all of which is Greenbelt being allocated for only 406 homes. What is all the spare land going to be used for?

I object as it is Greenbelt and no special circumstances have been provided for its change of use.

I object as it will cause further congestion to roads which are already gridlocked in Rush Hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3096  Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

I object to this huge land parcel of 29 Hectares, all of which is Greenbelt being allocated for only 406 homes. What is all the spare land going to be used for?

I object as it is Greenbelt and no special circumstances have been provided for its change of use.

I object as it will cause further congestion to roads which are already gridlocked in Rush Hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1030</th>
<th>Respondent: 8731649 / Ian Slater</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7283</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732353 / Simon Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of Ripley I write to object to the local plan as the proposed development is not sustainable and I also object to the late inclusion of sit A43a Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6640</th>
<th>Respondent: 8732993 / Michael Weber</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/828  Respondent: 8734785 / Bill Houghton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch as: This is a precious natural barrier between Ripley & Send, It has long been established as an ancient woodland, It is an area susceptible to flooding, It will add extra traffic to existing roads which are already carrying more than are manageable at busy times of the day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6256  Respondent: 8735873 / David and Gillian Allan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling...
development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2333  **Respondent:** 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to Site A43**

The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2335  **Respondent:** 8741377 / Lisanne Mealing  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4734  **Respondent:** 8741761 / June Yorath  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arc site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Godden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1828  Respondent: 8744257 / Mary E Bridge  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4314  Respondent: 8744417 / Mark & Gillie Hammersley  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2469  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes in Policy A43, Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh because now in addition to the 400 homes, which now includes self build and custom plots, the proposal also includes 8 travelling/showpeople pitches where there is no proven demand for plots in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3066  Respondent: 8746753 / Miles Hackett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes in Policy A43, Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh because now in addition to the 400 homes, which now includes self build and custom plots, the proposal also includes 8 travelling/showpeople pitches where there is no proven demand for plots in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8248  Respondent: 8749473 / Charlotte Beckett  Agent:
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4075  **Respondent:** 8751105 / Amanda Harris  **Agent:** 8751105 / Amanda Harris

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/6108</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8769793 / Laura Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station in reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2301</th>
<th>Respondent: 8770177 / Phil Attwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. Development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4678</th>
<th>Respondent: 8770177 / Phil Attwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2247  Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge
concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1980  
Respondent: 8771233 / Ranald Mackinnon  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsustainable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2513  Respondent: 8771265 / H C MacKinnon  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick's Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4564  Respondent: 8772801 / David French  Agent:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3937  Respondent: 8774369 / Gary Cooper  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Garlick's Arch site.

This proposal has been included at a very late stage and has not been consulted upon previously. It was not included in the Regulation 18 draft.

There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant the development, but there are such circumstances which make it unacceptable, such as its conservation sensitivity, being covered with ancient woodland, with trees dating back to the 16th century.

According to the Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) required employment space has reduced by 80% since the previous draft plan, so is no need for the proposed 7000 sq m of industrial development on this site. If there is eventually such need, it should be situated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/264  Respondent: 8775169 / Shaun Cheyne  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Specific objections to Policy A43 and A43a: Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common / North Facing Slip Roads:

The proposal is for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing space. I object to this proposal on the basis of the following:

- This site has appeared very recently, it was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has not previously been consulted upon
- It falls within green belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents merging of settlements
- The site is particularly sensitive from a conservation standpoint, as it has ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century.

- This will add significant traffic to the local road infrastructure around Send and Send Marsh; these roads are already heavily overloaded, and there is no space to widen given the residential surroundings.

No amount of expert studies can replace personal experience; I urge anyone considering these proposals to try and travel on the A247 road through Send at peak times to see how impossible it already is to travel between the A3 and Woking. The B368 through Send Marsh is used as an alternative when the A247 is overloaded, and this will become the next constraint. The surrounding proposed developments such as Gosden Hill Farm will without doubt also want to use the slip road and increase traffic through these already constrained and overloaded village roads.

- Services such as doctors are already overloaded in the Send / Send Marsh / Ripley area. It is close to impossible to get a doctor’s appointment within a 3 – 4 day window at the Villages Medical Practice as it stands with current population; where has this been considered, what is the plan to provide services to this significant addition of people?

- Flood risk: Over recent years the flooding in Send Marsh has become progressively worse with changing weather conditions. As example I quote winter of 2013 / 2014. Adding such as significant amount of development can only make this situation more severe.

- Nature of the village will be forever changed; Send and Send Marsh will no longer be rural villages given the scale of this development.

If there is a need for more industrial space (which I still question particularly in light of Brexit), then why would this not be an extension of the existing Slyfield Industrial Estate?

I trust my objections will be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1698  Respondent: 8775169 / Shaun Cheyne  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

(2) I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

This again is an increase in number of houses and now inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots.

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
3. It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” have been stated or proven
4. Separation of villages is a key objective of the green belt. This development will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
5. It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation; I personally experienced this during heavy rains on recent years where the entire area is left flooded for days afterward
6. It will generate excessive traffic in an area that is already struggling to cope with the volume of cars on the road

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4579  Respondent: 8787969 / K Britton  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
potential for the stream to raise, the land floods. In addition the trees that are being removed will also exacerbate the problem. The copse is home to and regular visiting place for deer, foxes, owls, bats rabbits, hares not to mention a carpet of bluebells in spring.

The wooded part of this land contains ancient oaks. Many of these oaks are hundreds of years old. The land is bordered on other sides by Kiln Lane and Burnt Common Lane, both are narrow residential lanes and totally unsuitable for large amounts of traffic. Both lanes exit onto the B2215 Portsmouth Road. This road is a feeder road to the A3 and M25 which is heavily congested both night and morning.

Policy A43a This policy relates to a four way junction giving North and South bound entrances and exits to the A3. Whilst many local people would welcome easier access to the A3, the local feeder roads are all narrow and already congested. The Clandon Road A247 is again already heavily congested night and morning. When the road reaches the village of West Clandon where it becomes The Street, it narrows down even further. It is totally unsuitable as an access to the A3.

The Northbound access would run over a piece of Manorial land owned by the Manor of Dedswell and Papworth, surely such land should be preserved.

The implications for traffic are dramatic. Every day Portsmouth Road is stacked back from the M25 to the Send traffic lights on the A247 from 8.00am to about 9.15am every day and then the flow is reversed in the evening. As there are no improvement planned for the A247 and other surrounding feeder roads this is an unsuitable change.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Cladon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Cladon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/728  Respondent:  8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the last minute inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch site. This is extending the ribbon development of Ripley and will result in urban sprawl it is also on the site of an ancient woodland and is in the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2423  Respondent:  8796481 / Sally Erhardt  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
1. I object to the extensions to the development of the Green Belt. I object the the extension of Garlicks’s Arch site (A43). Green Belt should NOT be built on and this extension is UNACCEPTABLE.

2. There is significant confusion within the plan as to the reason for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the plan. Reasons of separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common are being ignored as BOTH sites are in the plan. The proposed changes to this plan are poorly thought out.

3. I object to the increase in housing at Garlick’s Arch A43. The potential increase in housing at Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of Ripley, Send and Clandon. These villages, as I’m sure you know, have a great rural history and this will be destroyed.

4. I object to the allocation of 6 travelling show people sites in A34 Garlicks Arch. There should be no inclusion of Travelling show people plots as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4387  Respondent: 8796673 / Suzanne Burroughs  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Cladon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Cladon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7677  Respondent: 8797601 / David Newell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

> I object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal.

> This site was removed from consideration before the previous draft of the plan was issued.

> I, along with many others, do not understand how this site has been brought back into the plan.

> I do not believe exceptional circumstances have been shown to justify taking this site out of the Green Belt. This site was not discussed in the Green Belt and Countryside study and there seems to have been no consideration of the justification for removing it from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7695  Respondent: 8798753 / Jane Reeves Newell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal.

This site was removed from consideration before the previous draft of the plan was issued.

I, along with many others, do not understand how this site has been brought back into the plan.

I do not believe exceptional circumstances have been shown to justify taking this site out of the Green Belt. This site was not discussed in the Green Belt and Countryside study and there seems to have been no consideration of the justification for removing it from the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1959  Respondent: 8798849 / David Williams  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.
• I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
• There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
• The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
• This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
• The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
• Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
• The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
• I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
• I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
• I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
• I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
• I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
• Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
• Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
• With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

- The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
- I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
- Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
- Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
- Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
- I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
- I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
- I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
- It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6185</th>
<th>Respondent: 8800545 / Bill Taylor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site was inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarly any employees at the empioyment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence in the proposed local plan that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council may have been offered the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land, if needed, could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available.

Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A Road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11) Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a significant negative impact for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

William Taylor - Objection to Local Plan

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to these areas on small roads which cannot be Improved and which were never designed for the current traffic levels let alone increases in traffic levels that would result if the proposal to build new on/off access to the A3 at Burnt common (A43a) were to proceed. The proposed Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/852  Respondent: 8800705 / Michael Cumper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of the new site known as Garlick’s Arch and the proposal to build hundreds of houses and thousands of square feet of industrial units on that land. No exceptional circumstances exist, there is ancient woodland and industrial development should be located and restricted to the current industrial development at Slyfield, where there is room for further development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/367  Respondent: 8800705 / Michael Cumper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 Garlicks Arch

There were thousands of objections to the original submission and these have been completed ignored. This is overdevelopment, riding roughshod over the Green Belt and in effect turning two villages, Send and Ripley into one town.
There is no evidence for the need for the Travelling Showpeople sites. The infrastructure is not capable of managing the current traffic let alone what this will create.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4500  Respondent: 8801505 / Paul Edwards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I2). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2182</th>
<th>Respondent: 8803617 / Timothy Bruton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to this site. It was not identified until June 2016 as a potential site for development. It had previously been rejected in the 2014 draft and no evidence has been produced to support the development of this site. The provision of 400 house totally distorts the Burn Common community and is massive addition to the population but with no addition amenities planned. There is one convenience store within walking distance. The schools and surgeries in Send and Ripley are too far to walk and in any case they are full in Send. The site contains ancient woodland of which there is very little in the parish of Send and the development has potential negative impact on this. The land is subject to flooding and the flood risk will be heightened by housing and industrial development. No case has been made for the industrial and commercial use of this site in preference to the alternative site at Burn Common which was the preferred option from the draft plan in 2014 and up to and including the May2016. Development of this site will have negative visual impact on the A£ and for views from the south of the A3 including the North Downs. The combination of Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Farm development will significantly alter the character of Guildford from a compact to county town to a sprawling urban conurbation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3121</th>
<th>Respondent: 8803841 / Wellesley Theodore Wallace</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the removal of this land from the Green Belt and to its allocation for approximately 400 homes (260 houses and140 flats) and up to 7,000 square metres for industrial or storage and distribution uses and slips roads to and from the A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments in relation to Policy A25 as to the Green Belt also apply to these sites.

These Policies make no mention of the traffic impact on the A247 through West Clandon all of which is in the Green Belt. That impact will be severe. Appendix B of the comments by Surrey County Council on the 2014 Draft Plan included the following:

"...the A247 [which] is a very heavily trafficked A class road and carries a heavy proportion of HGVs".

Sec also observed that there was "a very limited bus route".
Buses on route 463 run between Guildford and Woking via West Clandon. There are five buses a day to Woking running at intervals of two hours or more, the last passing Clandon station at 1740 hours; only one of these services runs through Ripley. There are seven buses a day to Guildford at intervals varying from 1½ hours to over 2 hours, the last passing Clandon Station at 1902 hours. There has been a recent consultation on a reduction of bus services but no decision has yet been announced.

The Land Availability Assessment 2016 in relation to the site stated correctly that the closest railway station is Clandon, that the pedestrian footway along the A247 is narrow in places, that it switches to different sides of the road and that there are bus stops close to the station. It made no mention of the infrequency of buses.

It is inevitable that a substantial proportion of residents at Garlick's Arch would need to use Clandon Station to get to and from work and would travel by car since the station is about 1½ miles away. The station car park has spaces for 150 cars and is already used to full capacity. A number of people use Clandon station because of the difficulty of parking at other stations on the line, including Effingham. Rail users travelling when the car park is likely to be full are often dropped and picked up on return thus generating additional trips. In addition to those living at Garlick's Arch, there would be persons travelling to work at Garlick's Arch as well as commercial traffic generated, some of which would use the A247 through West Clandon.

The Strategic Highway Assessment Report ("SHAR") prepared by SCC this year based on data provided by Guildford BC calculates the number and distribution of vehicle trips to and from each development site based on various scenarios. Table 3.3 gives the weekday average AM trips on Scenario 2 which adds development to 2031 of the most likely strategic sites under the Local Plan (but without mitigation schemes) to trips on Scenario 1 which consists of background growth plus developments for which there is already permission.

The total Scenario 1 figure in Table 3.3 for Garlick's Arch is zero, there being no permitted development. Under Scenario 2, 116 weekday average AM peak hour departures are forecast, consisting of 100 cars, 13 LGVs and 3 HGVs and 44 vehicle arrivals are forecast, 38 being cars. The peak hours are wrongly shown on page 20 as 1600 - 1900 whereas they should be 0700 - 1000 (see page 7). The average peak hour must be the total for the three hours divided by three and clearly understates the actual peak hour which will be much more concentrated. For reasons which are not explained, although Scenario 2 adds to the Do-minimum Scenario 1, seven AM departure trips are shown for Clandon in Table 3.2 covering Scenario 1 but zero departures are shown in Table 3.3.

At para 4.2.2 of SHAR it is stated that Scenario 2 traffic demand for all development proposed in the Local Plan "shows a marked deterioration in the performance of the network when compared with Scenario 1".

Table 4.1 forecasts that under Scenario 3, which includes mitigation measures among which are the slip roads under Policy 43a at Burnt Common, there would be an increase in southbound traffic along the A247 Clandon Road at an average AM peak hour from 936 vehicles per hour under Scenario 1 to 1269 vph which is 36%. That Table shows the ratio of traffic flow to theoretical capacity ("RFC") under Scenario 3 as 1.1, as a result of which "flow breakdown and extensive queues can be expected"; the level of service ("LOS") is shown as "F" which indicates "every vehicle moves in lockstep with the vehicle in front of it with frequent slowing required".

At para 5.1.7 it is stated that the results of the assessment indicate that if the schemes in the Department of Transport's Road Investment Strategy ("RIS") are not forthcoming the residual cumulative impact of the Local Plan on the highway network could be considered severe. This is of course viewing the highway network in the borough as a whole. It must follow that the effect of particular developments on specific roads such as the A247 would be more severe.

The SHAR is a statistical exercise based on differing scenarios and does not consider any features of particular roads such as the A247. I have already referred above to the comments of Surrey County Council on the A247 in respect of the 2014 Draft Plan and to the Land Availability Assessment 2016 which mentioned the narrowness of the footpath in places and the switches to different sides of the road.

Table 4.4 which I have referred to above estimates the southbound traffic on the A247 at an average AM peak hour as 936 vehicles on Scenario 3. The flow of northbound traffic along the A247 going towards the A3, London via Ripley and Woking may if anything be greater. Although the weight of traffic slows speeds at peak hours, at other times the 30mph limit is regularly ignored by lorries and cars also. The width of the A247 varies, being quite narrow in places, and
the sight lines are poor particularly at the hump baked bridge over the railway (a photograph of which I provided with my comments in 2014), outside the church, outside the school, beside Summers and at Lime Grove. There is a particular problem when lorries or buses pass each other. It is not possible to see any scope for mitigation of the traffic problems on the A247. The traffic lights at the junction between the A247 and the A246 have caused problems of their own. The existing traffic problems on the A247 in Clandon are serious. Policies A43, and much more so A43a, would make them severe.

Policies A43 and A43a are not legally compliant in particular for the reasons set out in answer to question 2. The evidence base and submission documents are so extensive and difficult to access that it has not been possible to consider most of their content in any detail within the short time limit allowed. The passage cited from the judgement of Webster J applies here but has not been observed.

Policies A43 and A43a are not sound for the reasons given in my answer to question 3 coupled with the matters set out in my comments above on those policies.

My comments on question 4 apply to Policies A43 and A43a.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4018  Respondent: 8803841 / Wellesley Theodore Wallace  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

Although the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (2015) states at para 17 that land removed from the Green Belt to meet an identified need for a traveller site should be specifically allocated in the plan as a traveller site only, no specific allocation has been made. Requirement (7) refers to 'village' in the singular without specifying which village. It is quite likely that several large vehicles with trailers will liaise in convoy to the same destination, creating an additional problem is using the A247.

Leave the existing Green Belt boundary unchanged.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1249  Respondent: 8806849 / Roland McKinney  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This site is in the Green Belt - developing it will cause great harm to the Green Belt. No special circumstances have been given for this development, other than the need for houses, which is not an adequate reason. This is covered in more detail in the attachment.

The sequential test has not been employed at this site and so its flood risk should prevent its development.

Nor is there any need for extra employment land. This is solely because AECOM, who produced the Employment Land Needs Assessment adopted an unambitious target for land use efficiency. This target was just to be the same as the
national average. But because land in the borough is expensive and 89% of the borough is Green belt, there is a need for a much more ambitious land use efficiency, so land use efficiency is better than the best. This would eliminate the need for employment land on this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Site objection.pdf (617 KB)
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7484</th>
<th>Respondent: 8810849 / Charles Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley POLICY (A43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5980  Respondent: 8812833 / Simon P Hill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4789  Respondent: 8813409 / P Trusler  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land...
requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4549</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8813505 / Peter Grimble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause...
coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1346  Respondent: 8813601 / Gaenor Richards  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion in the Local Plan of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4925  Respondent: 8817121 / Celia Howard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4130  Respondent: 8817121 / Celia Howard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 400 houses and travellers sight on Garlicks Arch.

This bis much too many houses the only reason they will be affordable is because of the travellers sight.

We are a very quirt village with areas of greenbelt all around and it will be detrimental to the environment wild life and services to the villagers as the doctors surgeries hospital appointments and school places are all in short supply now

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3899  Respondent: 8817537 / Kim Meredith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh for the following reasons:

1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.
3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever by regained.
4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.
6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.
7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.
8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
4. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
5. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
6. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
7. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
8. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
9. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2073  **Respondent:** 8819457 / Howard Turner  **Agent:** 

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy A43 - Garlick's Arch

I have 'previously objected to the proposed development of 400 houses on this Green Belt and good agricultural land. The new policy A43 adds 8 travelling/showpeople pitches to this development rendering the policy even more inappropriate for the area. The Borough Council is reminded that less than 3 years ago it refused a planning application from 'Oldlands' to build just 25 houses in the same location. The Council cannot therefore incorporate this policy within the Plan and still maintain that it applies consistent and good practice.

This policy would increase the population of the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village by 49% and totally destroy its rural character.

I therefore strongly object to the revised proposal on the grounds that:

a) the village has no shops or other infrastructure to support the development:
b) the additional traffic generated would create major congestion on the already busy roads throughout the villages of Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley:
c) no exceptional circumstances exist to destroy this Green Belt land or the ancient woodland it contains:
d) there is no proven demand for travelling/showpeople pitches in this location, and
e) it would join up and destroy the distinct character of the villages of Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6347  **Respondent:** 8820353 / Gillian Beaton  **Agent:** 

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6302  Respondent: 8824609 / Richard Sands  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3) The Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6305  Respondent: 8824609 / Richard Sands  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch, The Plan should develop the existing brownfield site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch (A43).
The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope. A43

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7706</th>
<th>Respondent: 8825057 / Merrow Residents’ Association (Keith Meldrum)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Policy A43 and Policy A43A**

We have noted that Policy A43 and A43A were introduced into the draft at very short notice and without any consultation under section 18 of the Local Plan Regulations 2012.

The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding.

**We object to the inclusion of Policy A43 in the plan due to the high flood risk associated with this site and we conclude that this aspect of the plan is unsound.**

The Transport June 2016 topic paper suggests on page 25 that the slip roads in Policy A43A could provide a four way junction for Policy A25 Gosden Hill Farm. We note that this is only an aspiration and for that reason this suggestion does not appear in the draft Local Plan. We have explained on page 7 that there is an over-riding need for a four way junction north of Potters Lane at Gosden Hill Farm if that development is to go ahead. That being the case, there is no need for slip roads onto the A3 at Garlick’s Arch and therefore Policy A43A should be deleted.

**We object to the inclusion of A43A in the plan on the basis that there must be a four way junction north of Potters Lane at Gosden Hill Farm and therefore there is no need for slip roads onto the A3 at Garlick’s Arch.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2510</th>
<th>Respondent: 8826081 / Simon Wilcockson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6403  **Respondent:** 8826369 / Tim Madge  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Document:</strong></th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly, any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4393  Respondent: 8826369 / Tim Madge  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4681  Respondent: 8827777 / Mary English  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1417  Respondent: 8827809 / Robert Wood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development on this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A2.47 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current 'soft' edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BS). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4741</th>
<th>Respondent: 8827809 / Robert Wood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3011  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch. These are not needed in Send or the borough and the proposal was announced at the last minute without any prior consultation.

1. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. It is not needed and there is already an available site at Slyfield where it can be built.

1. I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is home to ancient woodland which should be conserved and it is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch as it is part of the Green Belt and helps stop merging of towns and settlements. This is the main purpose of the Green Belt. I believe it needs to stay as such.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3931  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
I object to the Policy A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh for the following reasons:

1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.
3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever by regained.
4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.
6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.
7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.
8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3934  Respondent: 8828385 / Thomas Meredith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5639  Respondent: 8828545 / Anjali Mittal  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I particularly object to Policy 43 - the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch which has significant implications for the local villages. The site has extensive ancient woodland which should not be destroyed. Previously the council has turned down development in this area due to the detrimental effect it would have on the Green Belt. Now the council proposes to go against its own advice. Small scale development was thought to be inappropriate & the council itself said, “There are no special circumstances which outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt…” so how can large scale development now be appropriate? The council needs to take notice of its own advice!

The scale & type of development is totally inappropriate for this area. The proposed 7000 sq. metres of industrial space would be much better situated at Slyfield. As the site floods, it is not suitable for this development nor the proposed 400 new houses. I do not believe that there is demand for so much commercial & industrial space. When premises have been made available previously through development in the village, it has proved very difficult to let or sell these sites. If there is demand, I do not know why the council removed the proposed plans for the North Slyfield Site from the local plan at the last moment.

In addition, the infrastructure cannot cope with large scale development. Local transport is extremely poor; bus times make it difficult to use buses to commute to the stations or to work in the towns & stop very early at night so are not suitable for evenings out, nor for young people going into the towns. Whole families have to rely on cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7119  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy 43 - the proposal to build 400 new houses at the Garlick’s Arch as the site already floods and this would be made worse if the site was developed. In addition, the house called Oatlands in Burnt Common Lane had a proposal for 25 houses turned down a couple of years ago so how can it now be right to allow 400 houses? This increase in population would completely change the village & create lots of additional problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2248  Respondent: 8828929 / Janice Hurdle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because I am concerned at the addition of travelling/showpeople pitches as this seems inappropriate alongside houses. The roads around Send & Ripley are also not suitable for their large vehicles & I am unsure as to why all 8 pitches should be placed in Send. Garlick’s Arch consists of ancient woodland in the green belt & there are no “exceptional circumstances” for developing it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5624  Respondent: 8835809 / Richard Golding  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT, this land is Green belt it contains two areas of ancient woodland 50% of the site is subject to flooding and is recognised locally as a FLOOD PLANE, any work carried to reduce the area flooded would increase the likely hood of flooding in Send Marsh, the Environment Agency undertook work a few years ago in Send Marsh to reduce the risk, but any work on Garlick’s Arch could neutralise the good work done. If the proposed development of 400 houses and industrial buildings takes place where will there surface water go, will it just be spirited away, it will certainly not soak into the ground under such a density of buildings, it will either finish up in the main drainage or the stream. Even if it goes into some form of soak away it will still finish up in the stream after percolating through the soil. I have attached a photograph of the flooding at Garlick’s Arch, when this photograph was taken 50% of the proposed site was flooded.

The ancient woodland on the site has protection under the NPPF section 118 if one locates a development of this size adjacent to woods it can not fail to damage it. I do realise the policy does allow exception for thing of national importance, but this certainly fails to meet that standard. 400 houses would give a minimum of 800 people 1600 feet tramping over the woodland. With this level of development there would be another 800 cars on the roads of Send assisting with the gridlock the council are working towards, I would also like to draw your attention to the fact the draft plan which was circulated for consultation had no mention of this site then by slight of hand two week before the plan went to council for a vote on adoption, this site appeared as an amendment to the circulated documents. This probable has more to do with the council wish to add additional entry points to the A3 and the gifting of the land for this by the owner of this site, Is this the correct way for a council to function? I don’t think so. The previous site proposed in the local plan for the industrial units has been dropped and Slyfield the main industrial area has been totally ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  DSC00608.jpg (133 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3234  Respondent: 8837313 / Maria Baker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (82) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately I 00 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents fallowing a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7631  **Respondent:** 8837729 / Harry Clarke  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. Policy A43 (Burnt Common) – **Object**
   1. Loss of Green Belt Land
   2. Extension of Settlement Area of Send Marsh

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/76  **Respondent:** 8838337 / Gregory Webb  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT STRONGLY to Policy A43, the use of land at Garlick’s Arch for the construction of 400 houses

1. There is no need for this housing on top of the 13,860 houses already proposed for the Borough
2. This site is NEW, was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously
3. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances to consider any override.
4. The site has conservation sensitivity as there are trees on the site from the 16th Century – part of the site is ancient woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/579  Respondent: 8839521 / Lynn Yeo  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly OBJECT to the last minute inclusion of the site at Garlick’s Arch in Send Marsh/ Burnt Common (A43 and A43a) the current draft of the Local Plan. This site is a major change at a very late stage, without prior consultation. Considering the severity of the change, I believe that its inclusion is inappropriate and potentially in breach of procedure. This was included less than two weeks before the draft was presented to Guildford Councillors, with no community consultation whatsoever, and appears to be in breach of Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to engage local communities in determining the Local Plan. Having sneaked this proposal in at the last minute without any consultation whatsoever with the community, the council has allotted a mere 6 weeks to register objections (half the usual time).

In addition to my objections based on procedural grounds, below is a list of objections based on the characteristics of the site, and the level of development proposed.

I object to destruction of ancient woodland (Policy P2, Policy I4)

Looking at the map supplied by GBC, approximately a fifth of the site at Garlick's Arch is made up of Ancient Woodland. It is also adjacent to another large parcel of Ancient Woodland. Ancient Woodland are at least 400 – 10,000 years old. To put this into context, the country is celebrating Elizabeth II’s 90th birthday this year. These woodlands have been in place since the reign of Elizabeth I or long before. According to the NPPF and planning advice on www.gov.uk, “Trees and woodland classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’ are irreplaceable. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is considered important for its wildlife, soils, recreation, cultural value, history and contribution to landscapes.” GBC should be doing everything it can to protect the small amount that is left in the borough. Ancient Woodlands are the Grade 1 listed buildings of our environment. We wouldn’t demolish a Grade 1 building for new development, we should protect Ancient Woodland in the same way.

I object to development in an area of good quality Green Belt (Policy P2, Policy I4)

This site lies within parcel B14, which according to the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study, fulfils 3 of the 4 Green Belt criteria, that is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. I believe that it is the duty of GBC to protect the Green Belt for current and future residents of Guildford. Building on the site at Garlick’s Arch is contrary to points 79 and 80 of the NPPF which states that “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.” Planning Practice Guidance issued by the Government in March 2013 (Standard note: SN/SC/934) makes...
clear that “unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.”

I understand that much of this site is in productive agricultural use. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being developed on as required by the NPPF.

**I object to inappropriate level of development for Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common (Policy I1)**

The proposal for Garlick's Arch site includes 7,000sqm of light and general industrial units as well as 400 houses and a 4 way on/off junction for the A3. This is an absurd level of development for the area will have a significant impact on the semi-rural village of Send. The village will become a significant junction on the A3 with increased vehicular and HGV traffic on the A247, that runs through Send village. The resulting noise and sound pollution as well as traffic congestion, will have a severe negative impact on the health and well being of current and future residents of Send. The current medical and educational facilities are not able to accommodate the large increase in population that would result from this oversized development. The need for additional housing has not been proven and additional industrial development could easily be incorporated at Slyfield.

**I object to development in Garlick's Arch which is at risk of flooding (Policy P4)**

The site at Garlick's Arch has been classified by the Environmental Agency as being at higher risk of flooding than the council's own assessment. It has flooded many times in previous years (please see attached photo of flooding at Garlick's Arch). The inclusion of this site shows that the local plan is not taking into adequate account the risk of flooding as required by the National Planning Policy.

I believe that the improper late inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch site, the inappropriateness of developing a high quality Green Belt site with Ancient Woodland, development on a site with high flood risk, and the significant level of development on the site, must result in the site being removed from the next draft of the Local Plan.

*I would like my comments to be seen by the Inspector.*

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

- [Garlicks Arch Flooding.jpg](133 KB)

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3872  **Respondent:** 8839521 / Lynn Yeo  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**3) I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch**

This site was a last minute addition to the last version of the local plan and it had received thousands of objections. Its inclusion in this version with increased plots for travelling show people shows a complete disregard for local residents who are already faced with overcrowded roads and medical and educational facilities.

Not only is there no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this area, this site is also not suitable for the provision of such plots according to Policy H1 which provides the strategic policy for the provision of plots for travelling show people where provision is being made for 500 homes or more. This plot currently has an already excessive 400 homes proposed, but below the 500 home threshold for triggering Policy H1. There is also no detail of how these sites will be accessed by the heavy vehicles associated with these plots. I object to the travelling show people plots as unnecessary and inappropriate.
This site is in the Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist to justify its development, especially on the massive scale that has been suggested. It contains areas of Ancient Woodland, which I believe should be given the same protection status as Grade 1 listed buildings. Ancient Woodland are at least 400 – 10,000 years old. According to the NPPF and planning advice on www.gov.uk, “Trees and woodland classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’ are irreplaceable. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is considered important for its wildlife, soils, recreation, cultural value, history and contribution to landscapes.” GBC should be doing everything it can to protect the small amount that is left in the borough. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site. This includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600 or earlier. After all, we wouldn't tear down a Grade 1 building, why would we allow the destruction of Ancient Woodlands that have been in existence since at least the Tudor era? I object to development on this Green Belt site with Ancient Woodland.

This site is subject to frequent flooding and currently has zone 2 flooding allocation (zone 3 according to the Environmental Agency).

This development would join up the villages of Send, Ripley and West Clandon, defeating one of the key purposes of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4922</th>
<th>Respondent: 8839553 / David Burnett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to strongly OBJECT to the policy / site at Garlick’s Arch in Send Marsh/ Burnt Common (A43 and A43a) the current draft of the Local Plan. This site is a major change at a very late stage, without prior consultation. Considering the severity of the change, I believe that its inclusion is inappropriate and potentially in breach of procedure. This was included less than two weeks before the draft was presented to Guildford Councillors, with no community consultation whatsoever, and appears to be in breach of Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to engage local communities in determining the Local Plan. Having slipped this proposal in at the last minute without any consultation whatsoever with the community, the council has allotted a mere 6 weeks to register objections (half the usual time).

In addition to my objections based on procedural grounds, below is a list of objections based on the characteristics of the site, and the level of development proposed.

**I object to destruction of ancient woodland (Policy P2, Policy I4)**

Looking at the map supplied by GBC, approximately a fifth of the site at Garlick's Arch is made up of Ancient Woodland. It is also adjacent to another large parcel of Ancient Woodland. Ancient Woodland are at least 400 – 10,000 years old. According to the NPPF and planning advice on www.gov.uk, “Trees and woodland classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’ are irreplaceable. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is considered important for its wildlife, soils, recreation, cultural value, history and contribution to landscapes.” GBC should be doing everything it can to protect the small amount that is left in the borough. Ancient Woodlands are the Grade 1 listed buildings of our environment. We wouldn’t demolish a Grade 1 building for new development, we should protect Ancient Woodland in the same way.

**I object to development in an area of good quality Green Belt (Policy P2, Policy I4)**
This site lies within parcel B14, which according to the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study, fulfils 3 of
the 4 Green Belt criteria, that is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns
from merging into one another and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. I believe that it is the
duty of GBC to protect the Green Belt for current and future residents of Guildford. Building on the site at Garlick’s Arch
is contrary to points 79 and 80 of the NPPF which states that “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent
urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their
permanence.” Planning Practice Guidance issued by the Government in March 2013 (Standard note: SN/SC/934) makes
clear that “unmet housing need (including for traveller sites) is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other
harm to constitute the “very special circumstances” justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt.”
I understand that much of this site is in productive agricultural use. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site
being developed on as required by the NPPF.

I object to inappropriate level of development for Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common (Policy I1)

The proposal for Garlick's Arch site includes 7,000sqm of light and general industrial units as well as 400 houses and a 4
way on/off junction for the A3. This is an absurd level of development for the area will have a significant impact on the
semi-rural village of Send. The village will become a significant junction on the A3 with increased vehicular and HGV
traffic on the A247, that runs through Send village. Already the junction of the A247 and Tithebarns Lane is an accident
blackspot. The resulting noise and sound pollution as well as traffic congestion, will have a severe negative impact on the
health and well-being of current and future residents of Send. Already The current medical and educational facilities are
not able to accommodate the large increase in population that would result from this oversized development. The need for
additional housing has not been proven and additional industrial development could easily be incorporated at Slyfield.

With the addition of 400 houses here, and at some length to the nearest train station, we are going to see a huge increase
in local traffic. When the A3 is jammed, the lanes through East Clandon and Ockham become snarled and congested with
spill over traffic from the A3.

I object to development in Garlick's Arch which is at risk of flooding (Policy P4)

The site at Garlick's Arch has been classified by the Environmental Agency as being at higher risk of flooding than the
council's own assessment. It has flooded many times in previous years (please see attached photo of flooding at Garlick's
Arch). The inclusion of this site shows that the local plan is not taking into adequate account the risk of flooding as
required by the National Planning Policy Framework.

I believe that the improper late inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch site, the inappropriateness of developing a high quality
Green Belt site with Ancient Woodland, development on a site with high flood risk, and the significant level of
development on the site, must result in the site being removed from the next draft of the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  Garlicks_Arch_Flooding.jpg (133 KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3509</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8839553 / David Burnett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch

This site was a last minute addition to the last version of the local plan and it had received thousands of objections. Its
inclusion in this version with increased plots for travelling show people shows a complete disregard for local residents
who are already faced with overcrowded roads and medical and educational facilities.
Not only is there no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this area, this site is also not suitable for the provision of such plots according to Policy H1 which provides the strategic policy for the provision of plots for travelling show people where provision is being made for 500 homes or more. This plot currently has an already excessive 400 homes proposed, but below the 500 home threshold for triggering Policy H1. There is also no detail of how these sites will be accessed by the heavy vehicles associated with these plots. I object to the travelling show people plots as unnecessary and inappropriate.

This site is in the Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist to justify its development, especially on the massive scale that has been suggested. It contains areas of Ancient Woodland, which I believe should be given the same protection status as Grade 1 listed buildings. Ancient Woodland are at least 400 – 10,000 years old. According to the NPPF and planning advice on www.gov.uk, “Trees and woodland classed as ‘ancient’ or ‘veteran’ are irreplaceable. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is considered important for its wildlife, soils, recreation, cultural value, history and contribution to landscapes.” GBC should be doing everything it can to protect the small amount that is left in the borough. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site. This includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600 or earlier. After all, we wouldn't tear down a Grade 1 building, why would we allow the destruction of Ancient Woodlands that have been in existence since at least the Tudor era? I object to development on this Green Belt site with Ancient Woodland.

The removal in this draft of the local plan of industrial distribution space on this site is welcome.

This site is subject to frequent flooding and currently has zone 2 flooding allocation (zone 3 according to the Environmental Agency). The runoff from this site is channeled into a network of streams and channels through low lying Send Marsh before reaching the River Wey. Any increase in runoff from this site would be detrimental to the roads and houses of Send Marsh.

This development would join up the villages of Send, Ripley and West Clandon, defeating one of the key purposes of the Green Belt, and contrary to NPPF 79.

I find this policy contrary to NPPF 83, since 'exceptional circumstances' have not been demonstrated to justify altering Green Belt boundaries. I find this policy contrary to NPPF 87 & 88 due to the fact that ‘very special circumstances’ have not been met.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2243  Respondent: 8839745 / Ripley Parish Council (Suzie Powell-Cullingford)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

My objections to Site A43 amendments relate to the provision of 6 residential plots for Travelling Showpeople and the associated buildings and storage facilities. This is entirely inappropriate within this Greenbelt site, which is surrounded by ancient woodland. There is no clear demand for this Travelling Showpeople site and it is in clear contravention of the Regulation 19 which identifies a ratio of 1 traveller site per 500 new housing units, with 500 units being the minimum number to justify the inclusion of a traveller site. Given that the Garlicks Arch A43 site plans for 400 units, I would strongly object to this allocation. In any event, this site is entirely unsuitable for such a large industrial use, with no obvious wide road access and no clear reasoning as to why it is being located in this proposed residential site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2015</th>
<th>Respondent: 8840033 / Jimmy Daboo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the Green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well, I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over nine years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being...
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II). Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. I object regarding A43 as The Garlick’s Arch site was discounted as recently as February and has been included to facilitate the building of the junctions (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common which in turn is there to facilitate the inappropriate developments in Policies A25 Gosden Hill and A35 Former Wisley Airfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3455  Respondent: 8840161 / Richard Ayears  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I support the reinstatement of allocation A43 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, as set out in drafts of the Proposed Submission Local Plan reviewed by the Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board on 13 April 2016; following the removal of Policy A43.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7177  Respondent: 8840161 / Richard Ayears  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, the loss of the green spaces between local villages will result in the loss of village identities leading to an urban sprawl against the principles of the Metropolitan Green Belt, the cornerstone of planning policy.

I object regarding A43 as The Garlick’s Arch site was discounted as recently as February and has been included to facilitate the building of the junctions (Policy A43A) at Burnt Common which in turn is there to facilitate the inappropriate developments in Policies A25 Gosden Hill and A35 Former Wisley Airfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7181  Respondent: 8840161 / Richard Ayears  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I support the reinstatement of allocation A43 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, as set out in drafts of the Proposed Submission Local Plan reviewed by the Borough, Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board on 13 April 2016; following the removal of Policy A43.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Garlics Arch proposal as it uses valuable green belt land and the green space between the settlements at Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley resulting in unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Bely and the vistas locally and from the Surrey Hills AONB.

I continue to object to the inclusion of the following policies:

A36-A41 inclusive in the Horsleys, A43 at Garlick’s Arch, A42 Clockbarn, and A58 There is no evidence that anyone has considered the cumulative impact of these developments together with the development at A35. The infrastructure proposed is totally inadequate and, as these stand at the borough boundary will have a huge impact on residents throughout the borough and further afield, particularly those who use the A3.

I object to the fact that the land required at Garlick’s Arch is said to be almost 29ha where only 13ha is required at 30dph.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

B.ii. Policy A43 – My Objections

5) Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to housing on this site. It's Green Belt (NPPF 89). What are the exceptional circumstances that require this site to be developed?

It contains ancient woodland (NPPF 118). What is the need that clearly outweighs the loss?

It is within 5km of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and therefore any development is subject to EU/UK legislation (NPPF 119). The impact cannot be mitigated with SANGs because there is no evidence base to support SANGs as required by NRM6 viii, NPPF 158 and 166.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2753  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. The Garlick’s Arch site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt which is protected under the National Planning Policy Framework. It also represents unrestricted sprawl. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7592  Respondent: 8853025 / Charles Gibson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. The Garlick’s Arch site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt which is protected under the National Planning Policy Framework. It also represents unrestricted sprawl. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6612  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2490  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended with the corresponding destruction of the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. There will be yet more pressure on the infrastructure without any alleviation described in the plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3023  Respondent: 8854785 / Desmond McCann  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick's Arch. The allocation of 6 Travelling showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlick's Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the hiding of development by "deferment" (A24, A25, A26, A43). This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by "deferring" it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects: 1) to hide the number of houses actually being built (A24, A25, A26 - total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 - 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick's Arch. The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick's Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. There will be yet more pressure on the infrastructure without any alleviation described in the plan.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick's Arch. GBCs own reasons for including Garlick's Arch A43 in the 2016 version were - "The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm... (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]". The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs" Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as both sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the 'required' industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick's Arch to be included.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42). The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5: "We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan". The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick's Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the Green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5256</th>
<th>Respondent: 8855969 / Jonathan Murphy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. IOBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site (Policy I4).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8022  **Respondent:** 8858113 / Ramsey Nagaty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object** to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

I object to a new site being introduced yet the consultation proceeds on sch 19 basis. No prior consultation on this site has taken place and including it seriously raises a major difference which has serious implications including a possible tunnel and the extra traffic to the entrance and exit yet no funding for additional roads for connecting / departing traffic to/from the tunnel.

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are ever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well we are aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. We object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
24 POLICY A43 GARLICK’S ARCH

24.1 I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

24.2 It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

24.3 There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

24.4 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

24.5 The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

24.6 This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

24.7 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

24.8 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

24.9 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

24.10 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

24.11 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
24.12 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

24.13 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

24.14 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

24.15 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

24.16 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

24.17 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

24.18 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

24.19 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

24.20 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

24.21 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

24.22 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

24.23 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24.24 I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

24.25 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

24.26 It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5170  
Respondent: 8858881 / Stephen Meredith  
Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 and A43a in relation to plans for Garlick’s Arch. This site was only inserted into the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft. The site is not a sustainable site being far from infrastructure facilities and transport links. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. There is no evidence in the plan of the exceptional circumstances required to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland by which the site is bordered - a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

The stated preference in the Plan is to make best use of previously developed land. Nonetheless a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic as the route from London/M25 to Woking would be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 would go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLP16/7312  Respondent: 8859585 / Claire Yates  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This is a stunning area of Green Belt land, with ancient woodland (which should be protected) and an expanse of meadow grass which supports a vast amount of wildlife, and which is a beautiful visual amenity with bird song and souring sky larks which are an environmental asset to the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3323  Respondent: 8859585 / Claire Yates  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- This beautiful ancient woodland deserves to be preserved, not destroyed.
- Brown Field sites should be used for housing developments which will have less impact on the natural environment.
- Very many species of mammal, insect and bird will be destroyed or lose their home.
- Our precious woodland helps to protect us from poisonous air pollutants by trapping metallic particles on their leaves (study by Lancaster University).
- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist.
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive.
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I.
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years.
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
20. POLICY A43AND A43a– Garlick’s Arch

I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed.

The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available.

Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4462  Respondent: 8865537 / P Waldner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the
Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will
place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no
certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),
Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to
improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also
mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The
significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to
considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will
have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s
Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which
allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken.
The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the
local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
if the site remains unsold regard to “up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment” or “use of the land for affordable housing” raises very serious concerns about the suitability of the site for residential accommodation at all – within the 300 metre A3 Noise Corridor.

The amended Local Plan Strategy & Sites for A43 Garlic’s Arch totally overlooks the intense and persistent noise pollution from the A3 corridor which should have been assessed. Indeed it is an omission from the basic strategic plan. Best practice environment assessments in UK, Europe and Australia recognise potentially hazardous noise corridors for up to 300 metres from major trunk roads. The noise from the A3 at this location (full speed 70 mph+ traffic) is higher than in Guildford for 12+ hours every day including weekends. Noise levels are likely to exceed 70dBA for most of the site and up to 80dBA within 100 metres of the A3.

These noise levels are likely to be a physical and mental health hazard to residents in the area and especially to children if they wish to play outdoors or in summer where houses wish to have windows open. I suggest that the Borough Plan should have severe restrictions on new residential development with 200 metres of de-restricted stretches of the A3 throughout the Borough. Communities in Burpham are partially protected by a high berm and trees. To propose any new residential housing within 200 metres of the A3 (more than half this site) appears negligent or irresponsible. I will be seeking an independent investigation into this issue in Guildford. The only reference to noise concerns noise caused by travelling showpeople, not suffered by them. To propose to house Travelling Showpeople, Travellers, and Affordable Housing – the most vulnerable residential categories – in a high noise corridor area is more than irresponsible – it suggests deliberate prejudice against vulnerable groups.

Guildford Council already has a poor record for housing travellers by a major junction on the Blackwater Valley road. I am not a traveller but I lived in a caravan until I was 9 years old. I strongly oppose any new residential development in the A3 noise on community health and welfare grounds. I totally oppose use of this hazardous location for any vulnerable populations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6844</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan states the preference is for making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light to local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt &amp; Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, and these will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4591</th>
<th>Respondent: 8865985 / Grant Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clendon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clndon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clndon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clndon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** psp172/2079  **Respondent:** 8875233 / Richard Hiam  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4600  Respondent: 8875329 / Katherine Cornwall  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
4. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
5. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
6. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
7. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
8. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
9. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1075  Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT most strongly to the late addition of Garlick's Arch at Burntcommon (site no A43) to the above plan. Guildford Borough Council has not followed the correct process in adding Garlick's Arch at a very late stage to the new Draft Local Development Plan, and also by adding the new A3 road junction by the A247. They are trying to pass this under the short cut of Regulation 19, but it requires another full consultation under Regulation 18. This invalidates the whole process.

Garlick's Arch is an area of unspoilt Green Belt agricultural land of some 70 acres, which includes about 12 acres of ancient woodland (some of it dating back to the 16th century) and it should not be sacrificed for housing and industrial units. This site is an entirely unacceptable proposal. Any further industrial space required could easily be accommodated at Slylield.

Quite apart from losing Green Bell land, an estate of the proposed size of 400 houses plus 2 acres of industrial units, will generate extra traffic of about 800 cars and many HGV’s. This will put an unbearable pressure on all the roads around the Burntcommon roundabout especially at rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2324  Respondent: 8875361 / P A Clarke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to policy A43, Land at Garlick's Arch. No exceptional circumstances exist to develop this beautiful site with an area of ancient woodland; an area that is also subject to frequent flooding. There is no proven demand for traveller pitches and the surrounding roads cannot cope with the additional traffic that would be generated by the 400 planned homes. Development here would join up the villages of Ripley and Send which defeats the key objective of the Green Belt. Destroying the trees and greenery which help absorb noise and air pollution from the A3 will mean higher pollution in our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3465  Respondent: 8875457 / Mark Ground  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I OBJECT to the location for new employment floorspace at Garlick's Arch - Site A43 (Policy E2)

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class B 1 c, B2 and B8) floorspace will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Gorlick's Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3468  Respondent: 8875457 / Mark Ground  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B 1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4675  Respondent: 8875969 / Sean Gilchrist  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I refer to the draft local plan with regard to further housing development on the site of Garlick's Arch between Kiln Lane and Burnt Common, with 400 residential units and industrial use.

This plan will trap the historic village of Ripley and also the village of Send between the entry from and exit to the already totally overcrowded A3. The village of Ripley is already overloaded with traffic from the A3, and Newark Lane as a consequence is becoming a death trap. The villages will be totally submerged in fast traffic racing through day and night.

It is an unviable plan when further out there is land available to such development without ruining the lives of innocent people who reside in these beautiful villages. We must preserve our history at all costs. I am also totally opposed to the frightening plan for development of the old Wisley Airfield. I travel on the A3 regularly, and the danger posed by more traffic joining the road at the Ripley turn-off does not bear thinking about. Please register my opposition to both plans.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/663  **Respondent:** 8876961 / Rodney Bole  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Draft Local Development Plan - Send, Send Marsh & Burntcommon

I wish to OBJECT strongly against the addition of Garlick's Arch at Burntcommon (site no A43) to this Plan.

This area of unspoilt Green Belt agricultural land of some 70 acres .. which includes about 12 acres of ancient woodland (some of it dating back to the 16th century) is far too precious to be sacrificed to concrete and tarmac in the form of 400 houses and nearly 2 acres of industrial buildings and warehousing.

Quite apart from losing lovely Green Belt land, the extra traffic generated by an estate of this size, which will consist of about 800 cars and many HGV's, will put an unbearable pressure on all the roads around the Burntcommon roundabout (A247/B2215), especially at rush hour times. The proposal to create extra entry and exit slip roads from the A3, London bound, off the A247 Clandon Road will add grossly to the congestion.

As well as the roads being unable to cope with such huge population growth, neither will the local schools or the Villages Medical Centre.

This site is an entirely unacceptable proposal.

Please ensure that the Government's Planning Inspector sees this letter

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2158  **Respondent:** 8879937 / Dietlinde Brown  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to the already large Garlick’s Arch (A43) site being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy. The increase in housing allocation here will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. Indeed the inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2163  Respondent: 8879937 / Dietlinde Brown  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)
This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have the effect of hiding the number of housed actually being built and giving an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2222  Respondent: 8880385 / John Telfer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the developments proposed on land at Garlick’s Arch policy A43 for 400 homes and 6 or 8 Travelling Showpeople plots. Again it ignores thousands of previous objections. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots This Green Belt land is covered in ancient trees and intended to be a space between Ripley and Send, and “exceptional circumstances” have not been demonstrated. There is also a number of electrical pylons across the site and a corridoe must be made for maintenance of high tension transmission lines. The site is prone to flooding hence considered a flood zone 2. This scheme will again add to traffic congestion and air pollution along the old A3 and affect adjoining roads and put massive unwarranted pressure on existing infractures.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1627  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to building on the Green Belt at Garlick's Arch in Send, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by special circumstances and after all the Green Belt is meant be permanent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1630  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m, at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If in fact there really is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because it is covered in ancient woodland with trees going back to the 161 century and furthermore a risk of flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1635  Respondent: 8880929 / Maurice Dawes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 400 houses at Garlick's Arch as we were only given 2 week's notice of this with no prior consultation and there is no need for this either for the Borough or Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3254  Respondent: 8881345 / Lynne Ground  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2578  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7473  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/953  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Greenbelt Land. The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Clandon, Ripley and Send and will cause an unnecessary coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/954  Respondent: 8883841 / Pamela French  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The inclusion of six plots for travelling show people with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the local plan documentation. The allocation of six travelling show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 local plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2875  Respondent: 8886945 / Brian Osborn  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I reiterate my objection to site A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley I previously made to the 2016 consultation as building 400 houses on this site as this site was not included in the initial consultation of the Draft Local Plan in 2014 and it would be overdevelopment of Send and Ripley villages. Allocating travellers “pitches” in the twenty first century is outdated and instead the Council should be providing and encouraging suitable housing for traveller communities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7949  Respondent: 8889761 / A Dougherty  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3. I OBJECT to site A43 Garlicks Arch this is an area of Ancient Woodland and has a Flood Zone 3 designation as well as identified habitat of Owls, Various Birds of Prey, Nesting Bats, Badgers & Water Vowls.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7950  Respondent: 8889761 / A Dougherty  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Borough plan as shown this is not correct specifically to sites A43 & A43a as it shows land which is privately owned and GBC have not attained any permissions to this land being used.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7952  Respondent: 8889761 / A Dougherty  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8. I OBJECT to the increase of Industrial Units at Garlicks Arch when there is already an existing Industrial site in Burntcommon and suitable for increasing without any infrastructure alterations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the use of Land at Garlick’s Arch as Development site when over a number of years the primary refusal of previous extensions and small scale development has been REFUSED and I state the reason being, "Chapter 9 of the NPPF and there are no overriding reasons that would constitute very special circumstances to justify the harm that it would cause to the Green Belt"

GBC themselves have stated in the past previously to development around Burnt Common

" It is therefore considered that the substantial harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, and the harm caused would outweigh the benefits identified and therefore this application is recommended for refusal"

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with a sustainable means of transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable and safe walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. I suggest again that this development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3) development.

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland, that is marked as an area of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

I can observe both the Greenbelt and Woodland in question from my property, as a result I know that it has an abundance of wildlife, many of which are protected. It is home to many types of Owls (Tawny, Little and Barn) and a large number of bats, a number of songbirds, Cuckoos and Woodpeckers. In addition there are badgers setts, with a host breeding families of deer that roam across the land surrounding Tithebarns Land. In late summer, once the harvest has been made,
the fields host large gatherings of Canada Goose and visiting Egyptian Geese. I have also spotted breeding families of Kestrels, Red Kites and Bustards, as the long grasses the right feeding habitat. In recent weeks, I have also spotted several nesting Red-legged Partridge. As soon as construction starts, their habitat will be ‘at best’ at risk’ but most likely lost. I note that no wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. As a Governor of a local school, I am acutely aware of the pressure to provide services, so I would like to question how will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, the site has a number of several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents, associated with the transfer of electromagnetic radiation (EMR).

I would like to draw your attention to a report in 2001 from the National Radiation Protection Board (NRPB) said that there may be a very slight increased risk for leukaemia in children. A further study in 2005, looked at how close children lived to high voltage power lines when they were born. The aim of the study was to find out if this affected their chance of getting leukaemia. It found that children who lived within 200 metres from these lines had an increased risk of getting leukaemia. It also showed a smaller increase in risk for children living between 200 and 600 metres from these lines.

Again, further evidence highlighting that this site is not viable for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4309  Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4630  Respondent: 8892737 / David Eagle  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.i.i. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I2). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I3). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7659  **Respondent:** 8893057 / Dianne Garnett  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1.1 **We object** to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

1.2 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.3 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

1.4 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

1.5 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

1.6 We object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

1.7 We object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

1.8 We object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.
1.9 We object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

1.10 We object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

1.11 We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

1.12 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1.13 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

1.14 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

1.15 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. 1.16 We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

1.17 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

1.18 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

1.19 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

1.20 Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

1.21 We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are
already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

1.22 We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

1.23 We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

1.24 It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1543  Respondent: 8895233 / Clare Axten  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlick’s Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5993  Respondent: 8896097 / Andrew Fordham  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

21. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys.
Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car. The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4409</th>
<th>Respondent: 8896993 / Caroline Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no
certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),
Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to
improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also
mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The
significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to
considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will
have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s
Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which
allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken.
The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the
local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6052  Respondent: 8897089 / Pauline Rowland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

Ripley Village/Send

I strongly object to the proposal for 400 houses between Burnt Common and Ripley. The proposal would practically join
the villages into one large urban sprawl and, again, the local roads cannot accommodate any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2139  Respondent: 8897377 / Jan Jewers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

13. I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch in Green Belt and ancient woodlands

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
SITE A43 GARLICKS ARCH

This is Greenbelt Land and the revised plan is increasing the number of homes to a minimum of 400, which with all the other proposed developments to the north of the borough is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Send, Ripley, and Clandon.

Inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots and associated storage facilities is totally inappropriate in a rural environment in Greenbelt land. There is no identified need within the Local Plan document for this allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

More specifically I live in Send Barns Lane which has seen much increased traffic over the last 5 years. Each morning and evening the traffic is at a standstill and when there is a breakdown or even a minor traffic accident the congestion can last for part of the morning. If you give the green light to build over 400 dwellings at Garlick's Arch which could represent another 800 cars our lifestyle will be ruined. The local infrastructure is at bursting point, you even have to queue for petrol at the Burntcommon garage now at any time. The local medical centre has about a one week plus waiting time to see your doctor now, this new proposed influx of 25% to the population to our village will breakdown local services not to mention the local schools which already caters for children outside of the local area. Already you have approved building developments in the Send area including a narrow boat basin for 80 boats. There aren't 80 boats on the canal, this was approved I assume to gain access for future housing development which has not yet been applied for. When will the desire to make money over people's lives stop.

If you continue to wreck our countryside and village life we will end up just an extension/suburb of London. Please do not approve more massive housing industrial estates.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, again the addition of hundreds more new homes on Green Belt lands is not acceptable. The previous comments still stand, is not the GBC not listening to the previous objections of local people.
There are no exceptional circumstances existing to continue and over develop the Green Belt in this beautiful village with history dating back to Elizabethen times. The purpose of the Green Belt must not be ignored. We must safeguard our wonderful woodland and open countryside.

This particular land I understand is a flood zone 2 area and any further development will cause additional flooding during parts of the year. Local wildlife will also be affected. More additional traffic will bring pollution in air quality and noise. There is no justification for this proposal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1711</th>
<th>Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the industrial use at Garlick's Arch when studies have shown a reduction in the need. Why put this development in the Green Belt when there are 40 ha. available at Slyfield?</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1717</th>
<th>Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the disproportionate and detrimental amount of building proposals for the Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common area. It seems that the area is required to surrender some 38 has. of Green Belt to satisfy the financial rewards of land owners and developers.</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2615</th>
<th>Respondent: 8899489 / A.A. White</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch I have been unable to find any justification in the Plan that requires the inclusion of a site for Travelling Showmen in this area. Travelling Showmen, by the very nature of their business TRAVEL. Is this site inclusion at Garlick's Arch for their winter quarters? We are all aware &quot;when the fair comes to town&quot; of the size and nature of showmen's vehicles and equipment and the long running of diesel generators with consequent atmospheric pollution. Yet again the wanton destruction of Green Belt and historic woodland. The increase of</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some likely 800 additional vehicle movements, on the naïve assumption of one car per household, in the immediate area to schools, doctor's surgery and supermarkets and workplaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. **I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land.

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site.

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. **I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land.
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition, there are regular sightings of badgers, deer, and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site.

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3753</th>
<th>Respondent: 8899713 / Tessa Crago</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly, any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt.
4. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
5. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
6. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
7. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
8. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.
10. Many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
11. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
12. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
13. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
14. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites. Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
15. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
16. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

17. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

18. I object on the grounds of poor air quality. The significant level of development being proposed will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

19. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley. Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

20. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1998  Respondent: 8900705 / Susan Fuller  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/411  **Respondent:** 8901121 / Sandra Peter Eperon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )*  

I object to the proposed development of the above sites for the following reasons:

Development of this area is totally inappropriate because Send and Ripley could not absorb 400 house and 700 square feet of industrial usage. As your plan does not include any infrastructure improvements it is obvious that at most times the traffic will become completely gridlocked. This does not take into consideration the proposed 4000 properties at Wisley and Gosden Hill Farm. The suggested four way entrances on to the A3 would also make a further impact on the area and would encourage traffic to and from Woking and Old Woking to use Send Road to reach this junction. Unless there is vast improvement to the infrastructure, e.g. shops, doctors, hospitals, dentists, schools all of which are already oversubscribed - where are all the people's facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4483  **Respondent:** 8901217 / Chris Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )*  

**C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches  
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people  
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location  
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.  
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.  
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.  
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.  
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport.

With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4414  Respondent: 8901633 / Duncan Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4260</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901953 / I.G. Howell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> (No), <strong>is Sound?</strong> (No), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> (No)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not legally compliant since the number of new houses required in Send which was 185 in April 2016 has now increased to 485 without a full consultation and is therefore illegal under regulation 18.

Employment needs figures are out of date, infrastructure requirements have been poorly or not addressed and the environmental sensitivity of the site ignored.

The addition of a new site like this without prior research or consultation is evidence that the council operates on a wing and a prayer agenda ignoring established legal criteria.

The area alongside the A3 and better known as the EWBANKS site which was removed from the 2014 plan on the grounds of the merging of settlement provision should likewise rule out the Gosden Hill site. However the former mentioned site should be reinstated in favour of all others as it is already brownfield in character and would not require the massive infrastructure changes required for the Garlick’s Arch development and would probably be far more acceptable to the residents of Send, if we have to have more homes in the area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/402</th>
<th>Respondent: 8901953 / I.G. Howell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object emphatically to any development at Garlick’s Arch. Council has failed to provide a need for self-build plots, additional employment floor space or travelling show people pitches, never mind in a valuable, rural Green Belt area which would be lost to the Nation. Send has no historical connection to these activities whatsoever and it appears that Send has been singled out for 'special attention'. An A3 'clover-leaf' junction (one assumes) goes 'hand in hand' with the Garlick’s Arch development plan. That idea in itself is ridiculous as:

1) It uses up more Green Belt land:

2) Destroys a proven functioning environment:

3) Burdens the A247 SendClandon Rd with M25 traffic destined to create deadlock in Old Woking. Should the Highways Agency ‘demand’ such an exit from the A3 it should by reason of common sense be at Burpham where it could be easily linked to the main Woking Rd (A320) through Slyfield. Has this even been considered?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8231</th>
<th>Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section page number</th>
<th>Document page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

 Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents. 

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4641</th>
<th>Respondent: 8903265 / Susan Anderson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6896  Respondent: 8904129 / Elizabeth Ross  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1958</th>
<th>Respondent: 8904673 / Colin Burnside</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the
pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/6899</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8905537 / Christopher Ross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6887  **Respondent:** 8906273 / G Baptist  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4432</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8906305 / Anne Fort</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4657</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8906305 / Anne Fort</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3463  **Respondent:** 8907137 / Jennifer A. Milligan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the removal of this site from the Green Belt. I object to the proposal of travelling showman pitches as Ripley already has 4 travellers pitches with more proposed on the A35 site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4330  **Respondent:** 8907393 / Helen Cannon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1896  **Respondent:** 8907425 / Julia Wood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017) and in particular to the changes affecting Ripley and Send, which make the Plan even worse than the 2016 proposals.

I object on these grounds:

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)**

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan."

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3194</th>
<th>Respondent: 8907905 / G.A. Phillips</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A43 - Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to houses to include some self-build and custom plots, addition of 8 travelling/showpeople patches and up to 7,000 sq m employment floorspace moved to A58 (Pages 144, 243-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/938</th>
<th>Respondent: 8909185 / Jamie Hogg</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43 |
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will add to the increasing flow of traffic with no options to add additional capacity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8197  
Respondent: 8909761 / Diana Grover  
Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the Policy A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh for the following reasons:

1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.
3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever by regained.
4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.
6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.
7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.
8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

Attached documents:
Policy A43: Land at Garlick’s Arch (page 221)

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods.

This was a sleight of hand by GBC in slipping this application into the Plan at such short notice. The site has never been proposed before and has not undergone a proper and full evaluation.

This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them. There is evidence suggesting a link between cancer/Leukaemia and power lines and this has not been considered.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site. Slyfield has room to expand and accommodate extra capacity and is well located on the edge of the town.

If Garlick’s Arch proceeds it will create traffic chaos in all the approach roads through the villages of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. There is simply no proven need to consider this site for industrial or housing, on any scale planned.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for deer and other wildlife. It was never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council’s ‘Issues and Options report’ or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.

In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from ‘Oldlands’ to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so how is can now be considered apt to construct 400 houses and 7,000sq.metres of employment space there?

Apart from the fact that this is all Green Belt land, the infrastructure just cannot support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just shop (Waitrose), no doctors’ surgery, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity.

Any development at all in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be to the very substantial detriment of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41%.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use. It is totally inappropriate and would destroy the village’s demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.
This very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process and therefore shall, if approved by your Council, be subject to immediate legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2929  **Respondent:** 8914049 / Diana Bridges  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Fields around Danesfield, Send Marsh (GU23 6LS)

I refer to this area because it is not currently high profile but it is a significant site for other reasons.

I wish to object to this site although it is not specifically mentioned. However, I understand this site is regarded as 'safeguarded' and therefore could come into play should some of the sites drop out.

If you look at the maps then you will see that the far end and sides of Danesfield have had their boundaries inset and now the back gardens of these houses now are the proposed greenbelt boundary. As we are surrounded by open fields then this suggests that everything the otherside, ie open fields, would be redesignated as non greenbelt and therefore will be developed.

My comments on this site are as follows:

1. This site is on a flood plain. Over 37% of the site is in flood zones 2 or 3, with over 25% in flood zone. Therefore, this land is clearly not suitable for development and this was borne out whenever there is heavy rain and the land floods. I am reliably informed that the area becomes almost a large lake when there is a heavy downpour and this can be seen from the road and footpaths.

1. GBC policy and the Environment Agency are against developing on flood zones and so for this reason the land should not be built on or developed. GBC could face legal action from the Environment Agency if they were to go against this and spend tax payer's funds to defend such a claim. This would be an irresponsible use of tax payer's money.

1. I know photographic evidence showing the effect of flooding on the site have been sent to GBC and they have accordingly downgraded the site from a Potential Development Area to a Safeguarded Area.

1. Any building or hard standing will reduce the land available to absorb the run off from heavy rain falls and this will exaggerate the flooding. This could cause flooding and damage to adjoining property in Danesfield which may lead to future insurance claims.

1. There are many bats on this site which are protected under The Conservation of Habits and Species

1. The access into the site is limited to only two points of One entry is onto the busy Send Marsh Road which is narrow and unsuitable to carry more traffic. This entry point is near to a blind bend so there would be a safety concern and a potential accident black spot with approaching traffic from the direction of Send. The other entry point is into the side of Danesfield where the access is deliberately narrow as it is a residential road where many families live with young children. There is only just enough room to get two cars passing so a massive increase in traffic would be totally impractical as well as dangerous for all the small children who play in the road. Furthermore, there is an old established oak tree on the entry point which would have to be cut down and I believe this has a TPO on it.
1. As a resident of Send for 50 years, and with my family living here and our garden backing onto this site, I am very concerned about what is being discussed regarding potential building on the site. It would be an absolute travesty if this land were to be lost to building. This corner of Send Marsh is of an open rural nature and therefore totally unsuitable for insetting from the green belt.

1. Our village is loved and cherished by all those of us who live in Send. Marsh has a long history of generations of families living here and we all love the open countryside, the lovely walks, the beautiful views and the village life atmosphere. To commence on such a thoughtless and aggressive building program would bring this to an end and would mean that we could never go back to what we once had.

1. The site should not be termed "safe guarded" as the meaning of 'safe' does not seem to As I understand the term as used here, this site could be back on the table as a possible contender for consideration for planning permission if other sites do not get their planning granted. There would not be a democratic process for this site to then have a further round of public consultation as the date will have been passed. We would then be at the mercy of GBC and the planners.

1. Send Marsh has already seen a dramatic increase in the traffic flowing through it and into Send village at peak hours with long tailbacks from the traffic lights at Mays Corner. Send Marsh regularly sees delays getting onto the Portsmouth Road at Send Dip with long queues of traffic going towards Ripley and Burnt.

1. This site is at the back of Danesfield has limited access onto Send Marsh Road and if this was the only way out then this would put a lot of strain onto an already congested road. If the access was through Danesfield then this would seriously congest our road as it is very narrow and difficult to pass cars at various points.

1. This site should not be removed "inset" from the green belt as this would mean planning permission would surely be granted for the future.

1. The field behind Danesfield is a beautiful open space with much wildlife including deer and foxes as well as lots of birdlife. The field is enjoyed by those in the village who walk and take their dogs by the adjoining footpaths.

1. Send Marsh Road has a very narrow and dangerous bridge which would need to be widened to make it safer and the whole of the Send Marsh Road would need to be There is no mention of this in the plan.

1. Send Marsh does not have any infrastructure. There are no local shops, no school, no doctor's surgery and no public park. It comprises mainly all houses and so the addition of so many new houses will put huge pressure on the infrastructure on Send and Ripley, both of which can hardly cope with the current pressures. You would have to walk a considerable distance to access any of these services and so this would mean owners would have to use a car. This would seem contrary to the government's policy for us all being green and reducing pollution.

1. The bus routes to and from both villages are very poor and infrequent, about one per hour. Again it is essential to have a car. The roads are too narrow and dangerous for cyclists so this is not really an option.

1. By proposing greenbelt sites in the area means this land will be gone forever. It is essential we protect the greenbelt or we will simply be a concrete jungle joined to Guildford and Woking with no green space in between. These greenbelt areas are essential to everyday living to provide clean and open space for everyone to enjoy.

1. There are plenty of brownfield sites available which should also be considered. In addition, there are sites which have been given planning permission but builders are refusing to build on as presumably, they are waiting for house prices to increase so they can maximise their profits. If time limits should be placed on planning permissions granted to encourage building in any economic climate.

1. Send Marsh is poorly served by schools, particularly the secondary. It has become increasingly difficult to get children into George Abbot which is the closest school to the village. With the amount of houses to be built set to increase, where will the children go to school if we don't have a plan to build schools?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. POLICY A43 Pages 243-5

I object to the Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposed changes to this site which in combination would generate considerable activity in a most unsuitable location.

Pitches designated for Show People suggests large vehicle traffic movements and a further extension to the commercial premises that have already been added on that side of the road all of which is located in close proximity to the surrounding residential area.

Increasing the number of houses would mean a truly massive increase in the volume of traffic which will only be able to use the A3, Send Road and travelling through Ripley, all of which are unsuitable for the level of traffic associated with such a development in the vicinity of these two villages.

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause log jams of these villages. Current traffic movements struggle to keep moving especially in the peak times of school delivery, pick up and commuting through to the M25. On many occasions at 5 pm traffic gets backed up from the A3 down to the village of Ripley and I spend 40 mins waiting to get through Ripley. Your proposals would make a bad situation worse in relation to traffic, pollution and safety with several primary schools in the area.

1. Garlick’s Arch (A43) should not be extended or even developed with the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

1. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Show people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Show people plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

1. The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

I further object to the Garlicks Arch site because if A58 Burt Common site and development at Gosden Hill Farm is also granted then the A3 corridor from Burpham to Ripley will be over developed and it will simply join up a sprawling set of developments. These in turn will lead to greater traffic density, slower journey times as well as increasing safety concerns for an infrastructure which cannot support this level of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The plan lacks any infrastructure proposals to support all the development. There are no proposed plans to upgrade roads or introduce new roads or links, and it is simply a plan of building additional housing and commercial facilities but expecting the current road system to support more traffic which it is incapable of doing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the New Park Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4699</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>8919009 / Andrew Kukielka</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people. There is no proven demand for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the
development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further
deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more
parking problems. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and
Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper
cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these
developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the
development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The
proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements
to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure
requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been
identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing
residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the
West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical
network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site. Without
proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical
Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and
suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing
health services. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There
is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch
(A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 &
M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make
the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate
its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of
development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion,
despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and
will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has
previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed
for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial
(B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land
from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The
Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services
such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
4. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5923  Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4504</th>
<th>Respondent: 8921377 / Paul Maycox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsustainable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland, containing trees which are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site is home to a range of important wildlife and development would remove important habitat. In spite of this, no wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site and as a local resident I am concerned that local services (schools, doctors etc. will not be able to cope. (Policy I1)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6342  **Respondent:** 8921857 / Claire Kukiela  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches.
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object to Guildford Borough Councils plan to build over 14,000 new homes under the revised Draft Local Plan. This proposal will damage the local communities by over development in particular Clandon and Ripley.

I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch there is no suitable infrastructure to support the extra housing and population.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy A43: Land at Garlick's Arch (page 221)

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods.

This was a sleight of hand by GBC in slipping this application into the Plan at such short notice and more than any other proposal in the new plan raises questions about the planning processes, governance and legality. The site has never been proposed before and has not undergone a proper and full evaluation.

This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them. There is evidence suggesting a link between cancer/Leukaemia and power lines and this has not been considered.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site. Slyfield has room to expand and accommodate extra capacity and is well located on the edge of the town.

If Garlick's Arch proceeds it will create traffic chaos in all the approach roads through the villages of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. There is simply no proven need to consider this site for industrial or housing, on any scale planned.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. of employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for deer and other wildlife. It was never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council's 'Issues and Options report' or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.

In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from 'Oldlands'to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so how is can now be considered apt to construct 400 houses and 7,000sq.metres of employment space there?

Apart from the fact that this is all Green Belt land, the infrastructure just cannot support such a development. Send Marsh/ Burnt Common has one just 'shop' (a Waitrose local housed within a petrol station), no doctors' surgery, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity. My daily commute requires me to drive along Send Road and as the only...
road connecting all the villages of Ripley, Glandon and Send it is already too heavily used and simply cannot accommodate any further significant increase in traffic volume. It only takes one small disturbance to the flow of traffic (for example a minor roadwork on the Send Road or along Broadlands) to completely bring traffic to a stop and cause a journey that should take 5 minutes to become 1 hour. This is something I have had to endure on numerous occasions in the last 18 months and I cannot begin to imagine the impact of 400 additional houses on this. Consider that if this development is permitted to go ahead by GBC, and the roads are simply unable to cater for the additional traffic (residential and industrial), it will not be desirable for new and existing residents who would most likely be affected by delays to their commute and personal travel or to businesses and could therefore discourage investment leaving empty units and properties.

Any development at all in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be to the very substantial detriment of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41%.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use. It is totally inappropriate and would destroy the village's demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.

This very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process and therefore shall, if approved by your Council, be subject to immediate legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2489  Respondent: 8923905 / Claire Bridges  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fields around Danesfield, Send Marsh (GU23 6LS)

I refer to this area because it is not currently high profile but it is a significant site for other reasons.

I wish to object to this site although it is not specifically mentioned. However, I understand this site is regarded as 'safeguarded' and therefore could come into play should some of the sites drop out.

If you look at the maps then you will see that the far end and sides of Danesfield have had their boundaries inset and now the back gardens of these houses now are the proposed greenbelt boundary. As we are surrounded by open fields then this suggests that everything the otherside, open fields, would be redesignated as non greenbelt and therefore will be My comments on this site are as follows:

1. This site is on a flood plain. Over 37% of the site is in flood zones 2 or 3, with over 25% in flood zone 3. Therefore, this land is clearly not suitable for development and this was borne out whenever there is heavy rain and the land I am reliably informed that the area becomes almost a large lake when there is a heavy downpour and this can be seen from the road and footpaths.

2. GBC policy and the Environment Agency are against developing on flood zones and so for this reason the land should not be built on or developed GBC could face legal action from the Environment Agency if they were to go against this and spend tax payer's funds to defend such a claim. This would be an irresponsible use of tax payer's money.
1. I know photographic evidence showing the effect of flooding on the site have been sent to GBC and they have accordingly downgraded the site from a Potential Development Area to a Safeguarded Area.

1. Any building or hard standing will reduce the land available to absorb the run off from heavy rain falls and this will exaggerate the flooding. This could cause flooding and damage to adjoining property in Danesfield which may lead to future insurance claims.

1. There are many bats on this site which are protected under The Conservation of Habits and Species Regulations.

1. The access into the site is limited to only two points of entry. One entry is onto the busy Send Marsh Road which is narrow and unsuitable to carry more. This entry point is near to a blind bend so there would be a safety concern and a potential accident black spot with approaching traffic from the direction of Send. The other entry point is into the side of Danesfield where the access is deliberately narrow as it is a residential road where many families live with young children. There is only just enough room to get two cars passing so a massive increase in traffic would be totally impractical as well as dangerous for all the small children who play in the road. Furthermore, there is an old established oak tree on the entry point which would have to be cut down and I believe this has a TPO on it.

1. As a resident of Send and with my family living here and our garden backing onto this site, I am very concerned about what is being discussed regarding potential building on the site. It would be an absolute travesty if this land were to be lost to building. This corner of Send Marsh is of an open rural nature and therefore totally unsuitable for insetting from the green belt.

1. Our village is loved and cherished by all those of us who live Send Marsh has a long history of generations of families living here and we all love the open countryside, the lovely walks, the beautiful views and the village life atmosphere. To commence on such a thoughtless and aggressive building program would bring this to an end and would mean that we could never go back to what we once had.

1. The site should not be termed "safe guarded" as the meaning of 'safe' does not seem to apply. As I understand the term as used here, this site could be back on the table as a possible contender for consideration for planning permission if other sites do not get their planning granted. There would not be a democratic process for this site to then have a further round of public consultation as the date will have been passed. We would then be at the mercy of GBC and the planners.

1. Send Marsh has already seen a dramatic increase in the traffic flowing through it and into Send village at peak hours with long tailbacks from the traffic lights at Mays Corner. Send Marsh regularly sees delays getting onto the Portsmouth Road at Send Dip with long queues of traffic going towards Ripley and Burnt Common.

1. This site is at the back of Danesfield has limited access onto Send Marsh Road and if this was the only way out then this would put a lot of strain onto an already congested road. If the access was through Danesfield then this would seriously congest our road as it is very narrow and difficult to pass cars at various points.

1. The field behind Danesfield is a beautiful open space with much wildlife including deer and foxes as well as lots of bird! The field is enjoyed by those in the village who walk and take their dogs by the adjoining footpaths.

1. Send Marsh Road has a very narrow and dangerous bridge which would need to be widened to make it safer and the whole of the Send Marsh Road would need to be There is no mention of this in the plan.

1. Send Marsh does not have any infrastructure. There are no local shops, no school, no doctor's surgery and no public park area. It comprises if mainly all houses and so the addition of so many new houses will put huge pressure on the infrastructure on Send and Ripley, both of which can hardly cope with the current pressures. You would have to walk a considerable distance to access any of these services and so this would mean owners...
would have to use a car. This would seem contrary to the government’s policy for us all being green and reducing pollution.

1. The bus routes to and from both villages are very poor and infrequent, about one per hour. Again it is essential to have a The roads are too narrow and dangerous for cyclists so this is not really an option.

1. By proposing greenbelt sites in the area means this land will be gone. It is essential we protect the greenbelt or we will simply be a concrete jungle joined to Guildford and Woking with no green space in between. These greenbelt areas are essential to everyday living to provide clean and open space for everyone to enjoy.

1. There are plenty of brownfield sites available which should also be considered. In addition, there are sites which have been given planning permission but builders are refusing to build on as presumably, they are waiting for house prices to increase so they can maximise their profits. Ifeet time limits should be placed on planning permissions granted to encourage building in any economic cli

1. Send Marsh is poorly served by schools, particularly the secondary. It has become increasingly difficult to get children into George Abbot which is the closest school to the village. With the amount of houses to be built set to increase, where will the children go to school if we don’t have a plan to build schools?

I would like to place on record my objections which I would like to be seen by the Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Policy A43: Land at Garlick’s Arch (page 221)

I object to this proposal because the number of homes proposed would add to local traffic congestion which is already excessive at peak travel periods.

This was a sleight of hand by GBC in slipping this application into the Plan at such short notice and more than any other proposal in the new plan raises questions about the planning processes, governance and legality. The site has never been proposed before and has not undergone a proper and full evaluation.

This site is also located underneath one or more pylons carrying power cables which constitute a health hazard for anyone and especially children living in such close proximity to them. There is evidence suggesting a link between cancer/Leukaemia and power lines and this has not been considered.

I also object to the location of any form of industrial activity which would increase traffic movements in that area leading to even greater traffic congestion. If additional industrial space is needed the ideal location is Slyfield which has the space to cater for it and there is a symbiotic relationship between the various activities on such a site. Slyfield has room to expand and accommodate extra capacity and is well located on the edge of the town.

If Garlick’s Arch proceeds it will create traffic chaos in all the approach roads through the villages of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. There is simply no proven need to consider this site for industrial or housing, on any scale planned.
I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. of employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on virgin Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for deer and other wildlife. It was never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council’s ‘Issues and Options report’ or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.

In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from ‘Oldlands’ to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so how is can now be considered apt to construct 400 houses and 7,000sq.metres of employment space there?

Apart from the fact that this is all Green Belt land, the infrastructure just cannot support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just ‘shop’ (a Waitrose local housed within a petrol station), no doctors’ surgery, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity. My daily commute requires me to drive along Send Road and as the only road connecting all the villages of Ripley, Clandon and Send it is already too heavily used and simply cannot accommodate any further significant increase in traffic volume. It only takes one small disturbance to the flow of traffic (for example a minor roadwork on the Send Road or along Broadlands) to completely bring traffic to a stop and cause a journey that should take 5 minutes to become 1 hour. This is something I have had to endure on numerous occasions in the last 18 months and I cannot begin to imagine the impact of 400 additional houses on this. Consider that if this development is permitted to go ahead by GBC, and the roads are simply unable to cater for the additional traffic (residential and industrial), it will not be desirable for new and existing residents who would most likely be affected by delays to their commute and personal travel or to businesses and could therefore discourage investment leaving empty units and properties.

Any development at all in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be to the very substantial detriment of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41%.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use. It is totally inappropriate and would destroy the village’s demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.

This very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process and therefore shall, if approved by your Council, be subject to immediate legal challenge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3842</th>
<th>Respondent: 8923905 / Claire Bridges</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposed changes to this site which in combination would generate considerable activity in a most unsuitable location.

Pitches designated for Show People suggests large vehicle traffic movements and a further extension to the commercial premises that have already been added on that side of the road all of which is located in close proximity to the surrounding residential area.
Increasing the number of houses would mean a truly massive increase in the volume of traffic which will only be able to use the A3, Send Road and travelling through Ripley, all of which are unsuitable for the level of traffic associated with such a development.

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause log jams of these villages.

- Garlick’s Arch (A43) should not be extended or even developed with the resulting urban sprawl. There are **no exceptional circumstances** for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

- **I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Show people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch**

The allocation of 6 Travelling Show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be **no** inclusion of any Travelling Show people plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

- **The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch**

I further object to the Garlicks Arch site because if A58 Burt Common site and development at Gosden Hill Farm is also granted then the A3 corridor from Burpham to Ripley will be over developed and it will simply join up a sprawling set of developments. These in turn will lead to greater traffic density, slower journey times as well as increasing safety concerns for an infrastructure which cannot support this level of traffic.

**I object to the proposed insetting around Send and Send Marsh.** If the new insetting boundary is adopted, then the land and all the surrounding fields for several miles around our village, by default, will become available for development and building, attracting builders to develop and build on large swathes of open countryside.

This is a completely irresponsible and reckless policy with no regard to co-ordinated planning and will lead to an out of control building frenzy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2495</th>
<th>Respondent: 8924353 / Ian Bull</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A 43. 30 ha land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, Send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have examined the plans to develop land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common , Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due the construction of the Ripley By-Pass, this site is now locked between roads and existing housing. However it does form a green barrier to the Burnt Common area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is in a fundamentally residential area and its partial proposed use for industrial/commercial development is wholly and totally inappropriate for this area. The villages of Send and Ripley are residential areas NOT industrial areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further more, the local roads are already congested at peak times and development such as that proposed will on ly make matters worse and will probably give ri se to peak-time grid lock. The local infrastructure is inadequate for further development in this area..

FOR THESE REASONS I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2586  Respondent: 8924577 / Charles Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common.

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport.

With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1).

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4609  Respondent: 8928289 / Trevor Skerritt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being...
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
thoroughness in development of the draft Local Plan. Is the council so easily swayed by a developer who offers a wonderful carrot of providing free land for entry and exit points from the A3 in order that he can make a huge profit without any regard to Green Belt restrictions.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/280  Respondent: 8929921 / Caspar Hancock  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

8) I OBJECT to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch (site A43).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2145  Respondent: 8930209 / Ray Corstin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the
east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause
immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no
Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes
    per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land
    requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt
    Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at
every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of
the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by
National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy
walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but
to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore,
there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6127  Respondent: 8931233 / John Pemberton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development on the following specific sites-

Site A43 Garlicks Arch which was announced a week before the ‘plan’ was published. The site is subject to flooding and is segmented by high voltage pylons.

Site A43 on/off ramp at Burnt Common/Clandon where the implications for local traffic have not been thought through.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3962  Respondent: 8931233 / John Pemberton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 changes at Garlick’s Arch increasing the housing between 400 and 650 homes and provision for travelling show people.

• The demand for show people plots is not explained.
• No exceptional circumstances are given for the use of the Green Belt
• This development would lead to the joining of Ripley, Send and West Clandon and destroy any notion of the Green Belt being used to separate villages.
• The traffic consequences for Ripley and Send are not explained.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/959  Respondent: 8933121 / Bryan Jackson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the massive "Garlick Arch" proposal for houses & Commercial buildings, your A43 reference. The amount of people, their cars the lorries & vans will see many more vehicle movements on the narrow roads which are already very busy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7732  Respondent: 8940225 / Glen Ruddy  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7782  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation at Garlick’s Arch – allocation A43 due to the loss of ancient woodland; the impact on all local infrastructure of another 400 houses; the site is too close to the A3 and will have poor air quality. There appears to be no joined up thinking on the various on/off junctions on the A3 – my understanding is that the SRN is meant to be for THROUGH TRAFFIC not local traffic. Numerous junctions will slow progress for all users and increase accidents due to more lane changes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4339  Respondent: 8944929 / A Jefferies  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the land required at Garlick’s Arch is said to be almost 29ha where only 13ha is required at 30dph.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1447  Respondent: 8947105 / Roy Harrington  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to the Guildford draft local plan 2016

I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the draft Local Plan recently produced.

It is an act of gross cynicism on the part of the Council to reject the Planning Application for the former Wisley Airfield, and then immediately to produce a draft plan which would not only give a green light to such a development, but also add greatly to pressure on local amenities and infrastructure by threatening to disapply Green Belt planning restrictions in the same area. What changed overnight? Nothing.
The justified (and, for about 24 hours, persuasive!) objections to the Wisley development are only aggravated by other current proposals at Garlick’s Arch and elsewhere in the immediate area to which the Ripley Action Group are objecting. Local amenities and infrastructure simply cannot handle the pressures that would result. Local roads are choked, Ripley High Street is regularly impassable, there are problems over schools, access to work, access to medical facilities, and more.

These classes of development cannot be regarded as sustainable. Local roads are already inadequate for pedestrian and cycle access – particularly relevant to the problems of additional car use which would result from such intensive development in this rural area where public transport is wholly inadequate. Roads serving much of the threatened Green Belt insets simply cannot be enlarged. The proposals for on/off access to the A3 at Burnt Common would require extensive additions to routes which are the responsibility of the national Highway Authority, which as I understand it has no plans or funds for any such works within the time frame of the Plan. This is the antithesis of planning: it is ‘press on regardless and to hell with local residents, infrastructure and amenity’!

There are particular objections to Garlick’s Arch development:-

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- It has ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

The Council seem to be volunteering Guildford for a far heavier level of development than is proposed by neighbouring boroughs. It appears to have doubled the assumed housing requirements compared with earlier estimates, but refuses to publish the SHMA report with its figures and assumptions. How can you expect any confidence in your consultation procedures if you present us with a ‘pig in a poke’?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to this site being included. It is in the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances for its removal. Its inclusion is a major change from the previous draft and has not been consulted on previously. It has been ignored in the Strategic Highway Assessment.

There is no need for housing on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4822  Respondent: 8949889 / A.H. Fielding  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the site A43 Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4992  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 homes and 7000 sq metres of Industrial Space at Garlick’s Arch. The site floods, and is in part ancient woodland and any building on the site would increase the off-run into the East Clandon Stream, and increase the risk of flooding downstream in Send Marsh despite the flood prevention works carried out following earlier incidents of flooding. The Pylons which march across this area would mean that the area of Green Belt sacrificed per home would be greater than alternative sites due to the need to allow space around the transmission lines. Also it is not clear that the suggested Industrial Space would be required if the reduced economic growth expected following the Brexit vote were properly reflected in the Council’s figures.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7003  Respondent: 8954977 / Patrick Sheard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A43 Garlick’s Arch

The Society objects to the proposed building of 400 homes and 7000 sq metres of Industrial Space at Garlick’s Arch. The site floods, and is in part ancient woodland and any building on the site would increase the off-run into the
East Clandon Stream, and increase the risk of flooding downstream in Send Marsh despite the flood prevention works carried out following earlier incidents of flooding. The Pylons which march across this area would mean that the area of Green Belt sacrificed per home would be greater than alternative sites due to the need to allow space around the transmission lines. Also it is not clear that the suggested Industrial Space would be required if the reduced economic growth expected following the Brexit vote were properly reflected in the Council’s figures.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5250  Respondent: 8961889 / F Turner  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
OBJECTION TO SITES RELATING TO POLICIES A43 & A43a: GARLICK'S ARCH, SEND MARSH, BURNT COMMON & RIPLEY

The proposal regarding Garlick's Arch was only submitted at a very late stage just before the consultation on the draft Local Plan began. It therefore needs to be considered under Regulation 18 rather than Regulation 19 rules.

It appears that an as yet unspecified developer has offered a new North facing slip road with access to the A3 in exchange for approval in principle to build at least 400 homes and an industrial estate on Green Belt land adjacent to this strategic highway for which Highways England are responsible. CPRE considers that a greater degree of transparency is required for this proposal to be assessed properly. It would for example be valuable to know when and how this offer has materialised and whether it is linked in any way with any other current proposal being considered in this locality in connection with the draft local plan.

It seems to us that this application has to be considered alongside several other development proposals which involve the A3 and depend on Highways Agency overview and agreement. These include the Wisley Airfield site (A35) for 2000 homes, which was unanimously refused by GBC at an earlier date before the draft local plan was available, the Gosden Hill site at Clandon/Burpham (A25) for 2,200 houses, the Slyfield Area Regeneration Project (A24) for 1,000 houses, and the Blackwell Fann site (A26) with 400 homes and an industrial estate at the Hogs Back for 1,800 homes. The common element to all these applications is that they depend on the input of the Highways Agency.

Additionally, we should bear in mind that the Royal Horticultural Gardens at Wisley, which is one of the largest tourist attractions in this part of England, have announced plans to expand visitor attendance from 940,000 to 1,400,000 in the years ahead which will be a further A3 traffic consideration that needs to be addressed. Without clarification from the Highways Agency as to how they intend to improve the traffic flow on the A3, which is already badly affected by peak hours congestion, and manage its various junctions with the M25, the B2251, the B2039, the A247, the A3100 and the A31 in particular, further assessment is premature.

Altogether over 7,000 houses are involved which seem certain to cause not only a crippling extra traffic burden for the A3 but also for our local road network.

It is not clear as yet how a 3 or 4 way on/off ramp at Burnt Common would work. It seems unlikely that it would alleviate traffic damage on a major scale for Clandon, Send or Ripley. CPRE therefore objects to this proposal which involves the loss of Green Belt to housing development, and is therefore directly against the Minister's statement that this would not be acceptable if local people were opposed to this and considered it inappropriate. CPRE OBJECTION.

CPRE further argues that it would be premature to include this proposal in the draft local plan as the overall implications of what is being considered are insufficiently described.

What changes (2016)/ further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The draft Proposed Submission Local Plan allocations for industrial / storage uses set out a number of considerations for each site, and these are directly quoted from the Plan in the table below. From this, it is clear that the North Slyfield Site has fewer constraints on development (and is therefore more deliverable) than the Submission Local Plan allocations. Please also note, as set out above, that the North Slyfield Site would be much more attractive to the market because it adjoins the existing premier industrial estate in Guildford and therefore benefits from existing infrastructure, business linkages and economies of scale.

There are also a number of other reasons why the North Slyfield Site is a better option for additional employment floorspace and should be prioritised, with the allocation reinstated. The full case for prioritising the North Slyfield Site can be summarised as follows:

**SARP**

1. The North Slyfield Site could meet the needs of a full range of Class B1c, B2 and B8 operators whereas the employment allocation at SARP is for Class B1c light industrial only.

2. The undeveloped parts of SARP share landscape characteristics with the North Slyfield Site and qualitatively there is little difference between them. However, SARP is closer to the River Wey and sensitive landscape and nature designations, and could therefore be said to be more sensitive.

3. The North Slyfield Site could be delivered now and within a five year timeframe. While SARP is a good option for additional light industrial floorspace, relocation of the sewage treatment plant and County depot and viability issues has hindered the scheme to date.

4. Employment allocation of the North Slyfield Site could help unlock SARP by relocating some of the existing or proposed light industrial uses at SARP to the extended SIE. This would allow more housing to be delivered at SARP and boost development value. In addition, the growth of SIE through this allocation would reinforce the case for bringing forward the proposed Clay Lane Link Road – another important Council aspiration.

**Wisley Airfield, Ockham**

This mixed-use allocation includes approximately 2,500 sq.m of B2 (industrial) and B8 (warehouse) floorspace, requiring 0.7 ha of land to build out.

1. The North Slyfield Site benefits from existing commercial infrastructure, linkages to other businesses and economies of scale; the small employment allocation at Wisley would not, and could not meet the needs of existing businesses wishing to expand or relocate within the urban area or to Guildford’s premier industrial location.

2. The North Slyfield Site is unconstrained by built and natural heritage and environmental constraints, unlike Wisley.

3. The North Slyfield Site benefits from existing natural boundary screening which would lessen the impacts of built development on the Green Belt / surrounding countryside; Wisley has no screening.

4. The North Slyfield Site is currently unused scrub; much of the Wisley allocation is currently farmed.

5. The North Slyfield Site could be delivered now and within a five year timeframe; there are question marks over the delivery of Wisley and a mixed use scheme was recently refused planning permission by the Council.

**Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh / Burntcommon**

This mixed-use allocation includes approximately 7,000 sq.m of B1(c) (light industrial), B2 (industrial) and B8 (warehouse) floorspace, requiring 1.75 ha of land to build out.
The North Slyfield Site benefits from existing commercial infrastructure, linkages to other businesses and economies of scale; the employment allocation at Garlick’s Arch could not meet the needs of existing businesses wishing to expand or relocate to Guildford’s premier industrial location or within the urban area.

The North Slyfield Site is set some distance from the houses on Jacobs Well Road and the existing boundary planting would attenuate noise; Burnt Oak is much closer to the residential properties to the north west of Burntcommon Lane and Portsmouth Road (B2215), and to the north east of Kiln Lane.

The North Slyfield Site is currently unused scrub; much of the Garlick’s Arch land is currently farmed. Again, the failure to allocate employment land “in the right place and at the right time” (as required by the NPPF) means that the Proposed Submission Local Plan has not been positively prepared, is ineffective and therefore unsound in this respect.

**The allocation of the North Slyfield Site for employment purposes did not arouse a significant degree of opposition from the general public or other stakeholders**

In response to the July 2014 draft Local Plan consultation, the Council received a very small number of representations in respect of removing the North Slyfield Site from the Green Belt and allocating it for employment purposes.

Ten responses either supported the allocation or did not object. Notably, this included support from the Guildford Society which backed the allocation particularly to accommodate displaced businesses in the town centre / at housing allocations.

Only 23 of the 20,000+ comments received by the Council raised concerns or objected to the North Slyfield Site (0.1% of all responses). There is therefore not a significant degree of local opposition to the North Slyfield Site’s removal from the Green Belt and employment allocation.

The key issues raised by respondents related principally to issues that have been addressed by NLP (on behalf of our client) in its original 29 November 2013 representations and which were found to be acceptable, at the time, by the Council in preparing the draft Local Plan (i.e. loss of Green Belt and the visual impacts of industrial development). Other matters including traffic, flood risk, noise and pollution impacts are capable of mitigation, would not have significant adverse impacts and would not outweigh the considerable economic and employment benefits. Importantly, these are development management matters which it would be appropriate to consider at the planning application stage.

Our letter (Annex 6) responding to the representations that were received contains further details.

**Conclusions**

The Proposed Submission Local Plan is unsound because it fails to positively and pro-actively plan for economic growth in the right place and at the right time as required by the NPPF:

1. The Plan fails to allocate a sufficient quantity of land in the Borough to meet demand and the need for employment floorspace, particularly for industrial and storage premises because the ELNA (2015) is 1) over-reliant on historic trends to estimate future requirements and 2) has limited consideration to local business and market conditions to inform the future requirements. These limitations reduce the soundness of the forecast requirements for industrial and storage land, and the actual amount of land that should be planned for should be higher than the currently proposed requirement. The failure to positively prepare to provide adequate employment land is also unsound because it is inconsistent with NPPF national policies to build a strong and competitive economy, and pro-actively meet the development needs of Guildford.

2. Qualitatively, the Plan fails to positively plan for additional employment land at SIE (a strategic employment site) to ensure that the premier industrial location in the Borough does not miss prospects to attract new businesses and retain existing, growing businesses. The ELNA itself highlights demand for businesses to locate to SIE, which currently has as little as 185sq.m of vacant industrial space, and limited prospects for intensification or additional space at the site. The North Slyfield Site is the only option available to expand industrial and warehousing at SIE and to plan for economic growth at the strategic location in the Borough where there is most demand.
3 Further, the North Slyfield Site is the only location that can support the industrial market in the Guildford Urban Area, and it is far more likely to be delivered than the proposed allocations at Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch (which cannot draw on the market value of an established strategic industrial location).

4 Allocation of the North Slyfield Site would also have other benefits for Guildford Borough:

   • Providing land for displaced businesses could support the release of previously developed employment sites in the town centre for housing development in accordance with the Guildford Town Centre Vision.
   • Supporting housing delivery on urban brownfield sites would help ease pressure on the release of Green Belt land.
   • An allocation at the North Slyfield Site could also help to unlock the stalled SARP scheme by relocating some of the existing or proposed industrial / storage / light industrial uses at SARP to SIE, which would allow a greater proportion of housing to be developed at SARP and boost the potential development value of the project. The failure to take such benefits into consideration also indicates that the Proposed Submission Local Plan has not been positively prepared, is inconsistent with national policies and is, therefore, unsound.

5 In addition to the strong economic / employment arguments in favour of allocating the North Slyfield Site for employment purposes, it is equally important to recognise that the North Slyfield Site is not a sensitive part of the Green Belt. Its release from the Green Belt for development would satisfy all five purposes of the Green Belt and there is no reason for the Council to depart from its original acceptance of this finding. Furthermore, Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch are more sensitive in landscape, heritage and habitat terms.

6 The other sites also have a number of constraints meaning that employment floorspace would be unlikely to be delivered within the short term (i.e. over the next five years). In contrast, the North Slyfield Site is readily available for development, with co-operative landowners and good quality infrastructure supporting delivery. It is also in a location that would be more attractive to the market and meeting demand. The risk profile associated with the North Slyfield Site is therefore low.

7 Finally, the allocation of the North Slyfield Site for employment purposes did not arouse a significant degree of opposition from the general public or other stakeholders.

For these reasons, the 4ha North Slyfield Site should be removed from the Green Belt and be allocated in the Guildford Local Plan for employment development within Classes B1c, B2 and B8. We urge the Council to reinstate the employment allocation for the North Slyfield Site in the Submission Local Plan that will be sent to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 13719 Proposed Submission Local Plan (Reg 19) Consultation Rep 18.07.16.PDF (8.3 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5909  Respondent: 8979265 / Rachel Taylor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5911  Respondent: 8979265 / Rachel Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/610  Respondent: 8980929 / Angela Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to Guildford Borough Council's draft Local Plan proposals to build 1,800 houses, an industrial park and a highway on the slopes of the Hog's Back at Blackwell Farm, which will:
- destroy views from the Hog's Back ridge - a nationally designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- remove 72 hectares of scenic farmland and additional ancient woodland from the green belt increase tail backs on the A31 and traffic congestion
- result in rat-running through local roads
- add to Guildford's pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/681  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1020  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1021  Respondent: 9009153 / Lindsay Mitchell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Show-people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Show-people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Show-people plots in A43 Garlick’s Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1945  Respondent: 9016897 / D Grover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7110  Respondent: 9042049 / Victoria Sandu  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development of Garlick's Arch off the Portsmouth Road to include the building of 400 houses and 7000 m2 of industrial space. This site floods on occasion and is covered by ancient woodland, including trees dating from the 16th century.

The 'Housing Delivery' document in the draft local plan suggests that this site is required to facilitate the provision of a northbound on and a southbound off slip road onto the A3 from the A247, which will provide significant improvements to the highway network and is fully supported by Surrey County Council. This document then goes on to state that 'On this basis we consider that the benefits of developing this site outweigh the harm that may be caused by removing this land from medium sensitivity Green Belt. This constitutes the exceptional circumstances required to amend Green Belt boundaries...' The addition of two slip roads providing access to and from the A3 does not constitute 'exceptional circumstances' and I object to Guildford Borough Council using this as a justification to modify the Green Belt in this area.

- I object to the area at Garlick's Arch having an additional 7000m2 of industrial space added as the latest Employment Lands Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction in required floorspace of 80% from the previous plan made in 2013. If any additional floorspace is required this should be located at Slyfield Industrial Estate which has had valid plans to expand since 2014.

- I object to the lack of due process that Guildford Borough Council have followed in reaching the decision to add the development of Garlick's Arch at the last minute, prior to including in the latest Local Plan. Since 2014 every proposed major development in Send and Send Marsh has been changed, with the original proposal for an additional 430 houses in 2014 being reduced to 185 by April 2016, and suddenly being increased to 485 in May 2016. Such large changes require full consultation under Regulation 19 of the planning process - this process has not been followed.

I urge Guildford Borough Council to reconsider the above changes currently being considered as part of the Local Plan, and look forward to reviewing a new plan that has been amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3717  Respondent: 9062913 / Susan Parker  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores
constraints.

The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha
and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not
28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times
the land required.

This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every
opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be
intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National
Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking
distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on
motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to
improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for
transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as
Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further
vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will
suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an
exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no
exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There
is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one
another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost
and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the
Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater
chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the
Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the
area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being
heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual
flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four
existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9
years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a
permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally
through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure
(Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road
and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion
in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4341   Respondent: 9094497 / Janet Stiles   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3213   Respondent: 9094753 / D Jones   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which
forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1780  Respondent: 9241793 / Nicky Wilson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

• The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, the villages will become a conurbation. Traffic congestion will increase through the villages and reduce the quality of life of villagers that have chosen to live in a green belt area.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

• The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

• The plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing”. So even more travellers pitches and houses, which is unjustified.

• Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.

• 1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]

• 2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

• The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2147  Respondent: 9298465 / Peter Grover  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3916  **Respondent:** 9323361 / Paul Holden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

- I object to housing and business development proposed for land described as Garlick's Arch,

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5281  **Respondent:** 9335041 / David Reeve  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
Policy A43 & A43a: Garlick’s Arch & Slip Roads, Burnt Common

**I object** on the grounds that the scale of development in the borough is unsubstantiated (see sections 1.1 and 1.2 above).

**I object** on the grounds that the Strategic Traffic Assessment for the slip roads associated with this site fails to provide credible data on the traffic impacts on the A247 through West Clandon and Send.

**I object** on the grounds that (in conjunction with other sites) this proposal would lead to – or certainly facilitate – an almost continuous ribbon of development along the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I have considered this Policy alongside Policies A25 (Gosden Hill Farm) and A58 (land around Burnt Common Warehouse). Together these three Allocated Sites form two miles of almost continuous dense development alongside the A3 trunk road, with a short break of just 700 yards separating A25 from A58. Moreover, A25 is itself adjacent to Burpham which is already part of the existing Guildford conurbation. NPPF paragraph 79 states that “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence”, and paragraph 80 states that the first of the five defined purposes of the Green Belt is “to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”. Sprawl is exactly what these three Policies, taken together achieve.

The joint impacts of these three Policies are fundamentally at odds with the provisions of NPPF, and with the many ministerial statements concerning the importance of the Green Belt – in particular its openness and its permanence. I strongly object to this Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Site A43 / Garlick’s Arch

1. I object to this proposal. In isolation I would welcome the provision of a 4 way access to the A3 at Burnt Common as part of this development. However I feel very uncomfortable about the plan for this development alongside sites A35 & A25. This would create a band of housing development totalling 4400 properties in a ribbon running from M25 / J10 to Guildford on land that is greenbelt.
2. I am particularly worried about the traffic management around the Burnt Common area. This is already a busy junction with the Portsmouth Road and with potentially additional traffic from Woking, Clandon as well as those travelling north & south on the A3. I fear this would become a major bottleneck.

Please will you take my comments into consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2942  Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15. I OBJECT, to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2950  Respondent: 9607905 / Anne Pascoe  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station with in reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6911  Respondent: 10326081 / Ian Wilkinson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This would profoundly alter the character of this sensitive area.

Ripley sits in a traffic junction lying between these six villages/locations; the traffic volumes created by these developments would dominate and ruin normal village life for all residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

12. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT TO the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch. There has not been any consultation on its inclusion and the impact to the surrounding area.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2515  Respondent: 10443169 / Rosslyn Reeves  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 at Garlicks Arch because it ignores the thousands of previous objections and this is Green Belt and Ancient Woodland. No Exceptional Circumstances exist here for ignoring Green Belt. There is no justification for Travelling Showpeople plots - why are these required? It is overdevelopment of the area and the number of homes planned is excessive. The land is prone to flooding and is also contaminated with lead shot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/84  Respondent: 10447777 / J Jordan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to developments in Send rushed through into the draft local plan.

I object to the 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial and warehousing proposed for the GREEN BELT land at Garlick’s Arch. Where is the sound evidence that further housing and industrial space is needed in Send? The Government promised protection of the Green Belt. How is it that GBC can just override this? Once you start building on Green Belt there is no stopping and no going back. And for what purpose? There are no exceptional circumstances to build this large number of houses plus industrial space on Green Belt land. Where are all these people? Martin Grant has slipped in 6 new homes recently and more houses are planned near Vision Engineering. There is already industrial space in Tannery Lane plus the Marina and warehousing at Burnt Common (where there was to be housing – now cancelled). 400 houses will bring another 800 cars on to the roads plus an indeterminate number of children with insufficient school places. Doctors’ surgery would be overwhelmed.

I object to the proposed junction on the A3 at Burnt Common. More Green Belt land lost there. I live in Send Barns Lane and every morning and evening the road is at a standstill. Send is a village and cars can be parked on the road and people need to cross the road at various places. The heavy traffic coming through it to get onto the A3 at Burnt Common would absolutely destroy Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/171  Respondent: 10447777 / J Jordan  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am writing to object to developments in Send rushed through into the draft Local Plan.

I object to the fact that GBC has not followed the correct process in connection with the changes made since 2014. The new proposed road junction and the number of houses require a full consultation under Regulation 18 - not the short cut of Regulation 19.

I object to 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial and warehousing proposed for the GREEN BELT land at Garlick's Arch. Where is the sound evidence that further housing and industrial space is needed in Send? The Government promised protection of the green belt. How is it that GBC can just override this? Once you start building on Green Belt land there is no stopping and no going back. And for what purpose? There are no exceptional circumstances to build this large number of houses plus industrial space on Green Belt land. Where are all these people? Martin Grant has slipped in 6 new homes recently and more houses are planned near Vision Engineering. There is already industrial space in Tannery Lane plus the Marina and warehousing near Burnt Common (where there was to be housing - now cancelled). 400 houses will bring another 800 cars on to the roads plus an indeterminate number of children with insufficient school places. Doctors’ surgery would be overwhelmed.

I object to the proposed junction on the A3 at Burnt Common. More Green Belt land lost then. I live in Send Barns Lane and every morning and evening the road is at a standstill. Send is a village and cars can be parked on the road and people need to cross the road at various places. The heavy traffic coming through it to get onto the A3 at Burnt Common would absolutely destroy Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object most strongly on two accounts. The new last minute [text unreadable] of the precious Green Belt land at Garlick’s Arch and the new 4 way interchange onto the A3 which would make our roads unbearable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Re: Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common

I strongly object to the proposed to develop the land known as Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common. This is a last minute change to the Local Plan and the manner in which this proposal was added by stealth is completely unacceptable. Due process was not conducted. My comments need to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

Public opinion is crucial as we all have to live and thrive in a community. Some reasonable growth in housing capacity is required and this has to be managed carefully and appropriately. The proposed development of in excess of 400 homes plus warehousing and industrial units is quite frankly ridiculous. The area simply cannot take any more. In the GBC’s literature (‘About Guildford’, Summer 2016) you state the following:

“One of the borough’s biggest assets is our significant green belt, and major consideration is given to protecting this.”

Borough Council election promises were to protect the Green Belt; evidence so far indicates that you are breaking these promises.

Key Reasons for objecting:

- Traffic Congestion: I object to what will be addition to the already congested roads in Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. The infrastructure in the area is not simply sufficient for hundreds of additional cars, haulage vehicles and cyclists, etc. The whole road system suffers greatly at peak times. Travelling from Send to Woking station takes ¾ hour rather than the usual 10 - 15 minutes. Ripley High Street cannot cope with the peak traffic at the beginning and end of the day even now let alone with more and more vehicles being channelled through the bottlenecks of Ripley and Send. Send Marsh Road, Portsmouth Road into Ripley and Send are already highly congested in the mornings and a further 400 houses cannot be tolerated on the road infrastructure. The M25/A3 Junction 10 is clogged from 0700 in the morning to well after 0900 and the tailbacks on the M25 towards junction 10 from the east start from at least the Leatherhead junction. More vehicles as a result of all the potential new houses are going to create mayhem, further delay and accidents.
- The quality of the roads: I object to the quality of the roads; both in terms of surface and width simply are not up to greater use. There are many pot holes causing damage to cars and cyclists (NB personally experienced damage to the car) and the situation will only worsen with the greater population
- Local services: I object to the already stretched local services and facilities in the immediate area. The Villages Surgery that services Send, Send Marsh and Ripley – would not be able to take more and more people. It is already nearly impossible to get an appointment with a Doctor. Local schools do not have the capacity for more people. The letterbox at the junction of Send Marsh Road and Portsmouth Road has just been removed; again an
I strongly object to the proposed to develop the land known as Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common. This is a last minute change to the Local Plan and the manner in which this proposal was added by stealth is completely unacceptable. Due process was not conducted. My comments need to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

Public opinion is crucial as we all have to live and thrive in a community. Some reasonable growth in housing capacity is required and this has to be managed carefully and appropriately. The proposed development of in excess of 400 homes plus warehousing and industrial units is quite frankly ridiculous. The area simply cannot take any more. In the GBC’s literature (‘About Guildford’, Summer 2016) you state the following:

“One of the borough’s biggest assets is our significant green belt, and major consideration is given to protecting this.”

Borough Council election promises were to protect the Green Belt; evidence so far indicates that you are breaking these promises.

Key Reasons for objecting:

• Traffic Congestion: I object to what will be addition to the already congested roads in Send, Send Marsh and Ripley. The infrastructure in the area is not simply sufficient for hundreds of additional cars, haulage vehicles and cyclists, etc. The whole road system suffers greatly at peak times. E.g. travelling from Send to Woking station takes ¾ hour rather than the usual 10 - 15 minutes. Ripley High Street cannot cope with the peak traffic at the beginning and end of the day even now let alone with more and more vehicles being channelled through the bottlenecks of Ripley and Send. Send Marsh Road, Portsmouth Road into Ripley and Send are already highly congested in the mornings and a further 400 houses cannot be tolerated on the road infrastructure. The M25/A3...
Junction 10 is clogged from 0700 in the morning to well after 0900 and the tailbacks on the M25 towards junction 10 from the east start from at least the Leatherhead junction. More vehicles as a result of all the potential new houses are going to create mayhem, further delay and accidents.

- **The quality of the roads:** I object to the quality of the roads; both in terms of surface and width simply are not up to greater use. There are many pot holes causing damage to cars and cyclists (NB personally experienced damage to the car) and the situation will only worsen with the greater population

- **Local services:** I object to the already stretched local services and facilities in the immediate area. The Villages Surgery that services Send, Send Marsh and Ripley – would not be able to take more and more people. It is already nearly impossible to get an appointment with a Doctor. Local schools do not have the capacity for more people.

- **The beautiful countryside:** I object to the fact that the countryside surrounding Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common is at risk of being lost. It needs to be preserved for future generations to enjoy. The area of Garlick’s Arch is agricultural green belt and ancient woodland and offers the appropriate break between the residential areas of Ripley and Send Marsh from the busy and noisy A3. I object to the continued onslaught by GBC of taking green belt land from the area which provides good breaks between Guildford, Woking and from the busy A3

- **Air Quality:** I object to the air pollution that will be greater if the industrial units and additional housing are built. More vehicles (especially haulage) will cause pollution. The area of Ripley, Send Marsh and Send are in a dip and has a micro climate; air pollution will languish in this dip

- **The need for additional housing:** I object to the assumption that additional housing is required in Send and Send Marsh. The need is simply not proven

- **Industrial units:** I object to the proposed relocation of industrial units from the proposal at Slyfield where there is sufficient and wanted expansion there

- **The outlook from the Maple Road development in Send Marsh:** I object to losing the view of the beautiful canopy of trees that line the view towards the A3 from Maple Road. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will destroy the skyline

Please do not destroy the existing communities that live in harmony with their environment (only just!) within the Send, Send Marsh, Ripley and Clandon areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no proven demand for plots to accommodate Travelling Showpeople.

National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt land. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. It constitutes over development. These further changes to the plan are not required. It is an unsustainable location. It will undoubtedly cause traffic chaos on the minor surrounding roads.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion, anyone who lives in these areas will confirm that this is the case. Substantially more vehicle movements will result in even more congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

This area contains ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century, which should be preserved. There is no good reason to tamper with it.

This site is identified as being in a Flood Zone 2 and regularly floods during winter months.

This site contains land which is heavily contaminated by many years of shooting with lead shot.

Above all, the changes to this site have completely ignored the thousands of previous comments from residents (who know the area best of all) during the 2016 Local Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to Policy A43 which I previously objected to that this land is Green Belt, with ancient woodland. The development would have a huge impact on the Flora, fauna and wildlife in the vicinity and development on this land will join the villages of Ripley and Send together defeating the object of the Green Belt. The local roads, doctors, schools, amenities are already struggling to cope with the existing residents and would be under pressure and would definitely not be fit to serve residents from another 400 homes.

Finally the housing numbers in the Local Plan has reduced by 39 per annum but Send’s contribution has increased with no justification, I therefore feel that consideration should be made to firstly the existing infrastructure especially A247 Send Road, Clandon Road and Portsmouth Road at Ripley, the bus service, doctors, schools, shops etc. should any development within Send be approved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1534  Respondent: 10551841 / N C and N O Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. Again, this proposal has taken no account of the huge number of objections. There has been no evidence to show the need for the addition of 6 travelling showpeople plots. The proposed enormous development in Green Belt is completely inappropriate and would change the village beyong measure creating a new town. Such overdevelopment in beautiful and ancient woodland would create a conurbation joining Send and Ripley. Green Belt is surely meant to protect against such a thing. There are really worrying issues about the great impact on traffic levels that such development would make on the local roads which are already congested, particularly at peak times.

Having lived in Send for 20+ years and locally in West Horsley for some 8 years prior to that, I have seen a rise in traffic and congestion problems on our local roads over this period. Such a large scale housing proposal can only cause traffic chaos. Again, flooding is likely to be an issue and the area is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. Moreover the land is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4443  Respondent: 10551937 / Anne Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Inadequate notification and planning for Developments 43 and 43a

The developments on Land a Garlick’s Arch were not included in the Draft Local Plan 2014, and it is only in the Draft Local Plan 2016 that I first learnt of them. Therefore, I object because it is unfair to make such a major change to the Plan with so little prior notification, and allow such a short consultation period of only 6 weeks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the changes in this policy, because:

1) This development is far too large for the local area to cope with. It will effectively join villages of Send, Send Marsh, and Ripley, to form one contiguous built-up area; forming, within a short time, a new town effectively.

2) I object to space being allotted to accommodate Gypsies and/or Travelling Showpeople in this area. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch of 400 houses as this was only included in the plan with only 2 weeks notice and without previous consultation and is not necessary for housing needs of the village or the borough. Also this site has a particular sensitivity as it is covered in ancient woodland with trees which date back to 16th century being endangered. The site is also frequently flooded.

I object to the proposed Industrial development at Garlick's Arch of 7,000 sq.m since a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space is shown in the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). Slyfield should be used if there is a need for 7,000 sq.m which has a 40ha site available.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1099  Respondent: 10563777 / Hazel Creasey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the number of new houses proposed at Garlicks Arch as this will add to the traffic through Send on the A247 which is already above tolerable limits.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1219  Respondent: 10563777 / Hazel Creasey  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY A43 change at Garlicks Arch because of the number of homes to be built despite previous objections. 6 plots for travelling showpeople is totally unnecessary as there is no proven demand. It will change the nature of Send and Ripley as two separate villages and will generate excessive amounts of traffic.

It is a flood risk area and is contaminated by lead shot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/329  Respondent: 10569697 / Shaun Butler  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick's Arch

I hereby wish to lodge my official objection to the proposed development of 43.3 ha of land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common.

This proposal was included a mere 2 weeks before submission to the full Council for approval at the end of June.

NO consultation with the general public, local people or anyone who uses this land (including myself) was entered into which is a terrible indication of the high-handed manner in which this proposed destruction of protected greenbelt land has been formulated.
This greenbelt land, containing ancient woodland, is in regular, sustainable use bringing enjoyment to many local people and should not have even been considered for development as it is protected by the NPPF in perpetuity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3132  Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A43 I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 week's notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

Site A43 I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015(ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40 hectare site available

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3134  Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Site A43 I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/625  Respondent: 10570049 / Jenny Peachey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43. Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Send

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots.
This ignores thousands of objections from local people and there is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.

There are no 'exceptional circumstances' to remove this from permanent Green Belt and it will cause over development of Send Village.

It will remove the green break of ancient woodland between Send and Ripley. The site is flood zone 2 allocation and frequently floods.

Excessive traffic will be generated and block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to rely on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I2). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/59  Respondent: 10582145 / Iris Prole  Agent: 10582145

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: Garlick’s Arch Site

I was horrified to learn just days ago that an amendment had been added to the Guildford Local Plan proposing a major new housing and industrial development between Sendmarsh Road and Burnt Common.

1. I object to the fact that this proposed new development appears to have been sneaked in through the back door just a few weeks after local residents had been notified of a significant reduction in planned new housing for Send. There has been no consultation with residents, and the Council’s Executive agreed the amendment fewer than five hours after it was submitted.

2. I object to the impact of such a development on air pollution, which will be significant, particularly with an inevitable increase in HGV's accessing and leaving the proposed industrial units. This will especially affect those people living on the Maple Road estate, where the land is much lower-lying than the Portsmouth Road, which runs along the back of these houses.

3. I object to this development because the infrastructure of the village simply cannot support it: Traffic joining the Portsmouth Road from both Sendmarsh Road and Broadmead Road is already extremely heavy during morning and evening rush hours, causing significant tailbacks through the village. There will also be a knock on effect from the increased traffic through Ripley, and on to the A3 at Burnt Common.

4. I object because of the already shocking quality of local roads – Sendmarsh Road and Polesden Lane especially have so many potholes that drivers are often forced to drive on the wrong side of the road, and there is a significant danger to cyclists. This will only worsen with the increase in traffic.

5. I object because there had already been sufficient planned expansion to the Slyfield Industrial estate in the form of light industry and warehousing, but I understand that this planned development has been withdrawn from the local plan, even though Slyfield is already used for this purpose and offers a much more appropriate site than what is being proposed.

6. I object to the inevitable increased pressure on local schools and medical facilities. The Villages Medical Practice is currently operating at full capacity, and all the doctors working there are concerned that they simply cannot provide sufficient medical care for the number of patients on their books. The Royal Surrey County Hospital is also at breaking point – not only is the amount of time it takes to be given an appointment after a referral unacceptable, but waiting times in A & E are horrendous. I have been admitted to the hospital three times this year as an emergency case, with waiting times before being transferred to the ward varying from eight to fourteen hours, even though government guidelines state that all cases should be seen within four hours. On the last occasion I was there for over five hours before even being assessed by a doctor, despite being 86 years old and in terrible pain.
A further 400 houses on top of the 185 already going ahead will put appalling pressure on the local infrastructure, and the planned industrial development – apart from being totally out of keeping with the area – will have a very negative impact on the local environment. I therefore object in the strongest possible terms and implore you to reconsider these ill-thought out proposals.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/857</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10582145 / Iris Prole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch for the following reasons:

1. 6 travelling/showpeople plots is excessive. We do not currently have large numbers of travellers in this area, so how can this be justified?
2. I thought that development on Green Belt Land was only to be permitted in “exceptional circumstances”. There are none.
3. 400 new homes is also excessive. This will cause severe over-development of the village and will have a catastrophic effect on the local infrastructure. Traffic on the Portsmouth Road and Send Marsh Road is already a major problem during the morning rush hour and 400 new homes with at least one car per home will significantly increase this, not to mention the effect it will have on pollution levels.
4. Development on this scale will place an enormous strain on the already overstretched resources at The Villages Medical Practice and The Royal Surrey Hospital.
5. I would like to know why I cannot have one large oak tree in my garden cut down for environmental reasons, yet it is perfectly acceptable for developers to destroy acres of beautiful ancient woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3113</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10616193 / Kate Mumford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3114</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10616193 / Kate Mumford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to site A43a, the on and off ramp at Burn Common

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/220  Respondent: 10616289 / Hilary Percy  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

New Proposals within the Updated Local Plan I should like to make comments on the following:- Site A43 Garlicks Arch Proposal for additional housing and travellers' plots is an overdevelopment of the site with little or no justification. Individual identities of Ripley, Send and Clandon would be lost. Huge amount of extra traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4343  Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1159  Respondent: 10616321 / Petrina Jeffreson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch) GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were:

a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, …(site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”

b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6147  Respondent: 10619169 / Wendy Critchlow  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/993  Respondent: 10620801 / E. H. and J. A. Strange  Agent:
I object to the new housing at A43 Garlicks Arch, as the development would cause many more cars to use the already clogged roads, through Ripley and Send.

Where there is much pollution now.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the late inclusion of the A43 Garlicks Arch development as resident of Burnt Common Lane this will have a substantial effect on myself and my family. This development will obviously completely change this small and sleepy hamlet of Send and Ripley. One of my main concerns is with regard to flooding. It is also a site with a large amount of ancient woodlands. The industrial development is certainly not needed, and with regard to the housing it my belief that the housing need for the area has been grossly exaggerated

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.
- The proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

The Plan should develop the existing brownfield site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch (A43).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to new sites (Garlics Arch) being introduced as an “after thought” when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the draft plan without Highways England’s consent. This will only add to the existing congestion on the A3 and M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object specifically to ‘Garlick’s Arch’ (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople sites in A34 ‘Garlick’s Arch’

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan. NB: A travelling showpersons site with associated storage is completely inappropriate in a rural environment, and I note the intention to release this land for additional housing in the future, should it prove an unnecessary allocation.

The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

*The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm… (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]” The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (Burnt Common and Garlicks Arch – which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives. A58 Burnt Common provides more than the “required” industrial space, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.
I object to the principle of hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan openly conceals some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5205  Respondent: 10638209 / Wendy Rockhill  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1528  Respondent: 10638241 / Irene M Bleach  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6059  Respondent: 10644417 / D Hill  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Adding 400 homes to Garlicks Copse will no longer alleviate the existing traffic burden and will add extra local traffic on Portsmouth Road / Send Road which you will still have to get across to get to the new junction

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/105</th>
<th>Respondent: 10648353 / Hugh Proctor</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site A43 Garlicks Arch</td>
<td>I object to the increase in houses to a figure over 600. I further object to the provision for Travelling Showpeople Plots, which would obviously involve the use of articulated lorries and other transportation vehicles. These would be wholly unsuitable in this area, especially when accessing on to the B2215 road. The proposed inclusion of these plots is out of line with the original plan and is in a Green Belt area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLP16/7696</th>
<th>Respondent: 10653537 / Mike Elrick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh - support proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 This proposed development appears to be entirely sustainable, and it is perhaps surprising that it was not identified previously. It has a long frontage adjacent to the A3 and, with suitable Sec 106 agreements, would have similar credentials to the Wisley aerodrome site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The NIMBY campaign by local groups should be given little weight. Such campaigns completely ignore the severe shortage of housing in both locally and nationally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2155</th>
<th>Respondent: 10667073 / Trudi Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch,Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BS). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy P3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that, with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )

Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I understand further to your plan to despoil this area of ancient woodland with 400 houses on Green Belt, you have now added 8 travelling/show people pitches without any real justification. The local plan HI policy states that ’Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more while there remains an identified need’ - so why is Send being allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as these 8 travelling showpeople plots (once again Send is being disproportionally targeted). Traditionally when the funfair comes to Ripley the showpeople park on the Green for the week (in late October) and then leave to move to Guildford for Bonfire Night - so where is the identifiable need?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2219  Respondent: 10683457 / Margaret Bruton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2.1 A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch

I object to this site. It was not identified until June 2016 as a potential site for development. It had previously been rejected in the 2014 draft and no evidence has been produced to support the development of this site. The provision of 400 house totally distorts the Burn Common community and is massive addition to the population but with no addition amenities planned. There is one convenience store within walking distance. The schools and surgeries in Send and Ripley are too far to walk and in any case they are full in Send. The site contains ancient woodland of which there is very little in the parish of Send and the development has potential negative impact on this. The land is subject to flooding and the flood risk will be heightened by housing and industrial development. No case has been made for the industrial and commercial use of this site in preference to the alternative site at Burnt Common which was the preferred option from the draft plan in 2014 and up to and including the May 2016. Development of this site will have negative visual impact on the A3 and for views from the south of the A3 including the North Downs. The combination of Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Farm development will significantly alter the character of Guildford from a compact to county town to a sprawling urban conurbation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7404  Respondent: 10692833 / Elizabeth Cope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the Plan’s failure to explore or propose brown field sites for the required development. In the near vicinity to the Garlicks Arch site there is a significant surplus of land on an already developed site to the south of Burnt Common which could be developed without damage to the Green Belt and the loss of rare Ancient Woodland. It is incumbent on the Borough’s planners to identify such sites. I am very concerned about the manner in which the Garlicks Arch site was surreptitiously substituted for a brownfield development at Burnt Common at the last minute before publication.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1667</th>
<th>Respondent: 10701537 / Ben Gamble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate</strong>? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1790</th>
<th>Respondent: 10702561 / Emily Gamble</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate</strong>? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The last minute removal of the Burnt Common Brownfield site and insertion of the Greenbelt Garlick’s Arch site is unacceptable. No consultation was held and residents only discovered this exchange after a council meeting on 11th May 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No wildlife report has been conducted. As a local resident I am aware these areas house many wild birds, including owls and red kites, plus badgers and their setts, whose habitat will be obliterated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst it is a paradise for wildlife, the electricity pylons which pepper the site will pose a health hazard to human residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4585</th>
<th>Respondent: 10703475 / Frank Fuller</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong>: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate</strong>? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch to allow for 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. This proposal will over-develop our village as this number of houses is unduly excessive and will erode the ancient woodland that has existed for hundreds of years. Guildford Borough Council should be protecting this area not developing it. It will join up Ripley and Send villages and will erode the Green Belt further and generate excessive traffic and block the already gridlocked roads. The area is prone to flooding and this proposal will increase the likelihood of further flood damage. There is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area, and ‘no exceptional circumstances’ exist to destroy the Green Belt status of this location. There are others areas in the Borough available for development. This area is already full to capacity, the Doctors Surgery and schools are struggling to cope with existing volumes as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to development on permanent Green Belt and that GBC have failed to establish and demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to do so.

I object that it will defeat the purpose and role of the Green Belt and that Ripley and Send will effectively become joined up.

I object because it will cause over-development in our villages and the number of homes is excessive to demonstrated need.

I object because it will result in traffic that will further block the local roads.

I object because it will impact on infrastructure and GBC have failed to address this.

I object because it will destroy beautiful countryside and ancient woodland.

I object because existing flooding problems in the area will just become exacerbated.

I object to the inclusion of 6 Traveling Showpeople plots; there is no evidence that this is necessitated in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1663  Respondent: 10718625 / Zareena Linney  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch, Where there are the "exceptional circumstances" that you need to build on ancient woodland, the area is currently a flood zone, it lays in the green belt, you will be causing congestion for our roads even more. There is no evidence that the travelling show people want to go there.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1611  Respondent: 10721089 / Y Beraud  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I object to policy A.43.30ha the use of land at GARLICKS ARCH burnt Common designated for 400 houses and 7.000 sq.m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13.860 already proposed for the borough. This proposed site is new and was not included in regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Its is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES. This site has a particular conservation Sensitivity since it is covered with Ancient Woodland, trees which have existed in the 16th century and would be endangered. The proposed Industrial Development of 7.000 sq.m is simply not required since the latest employment land needs assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7.000 sq.m of Industrial space it should be at Slyfield.
A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. The Send road (A247) would be gridlocked all day, Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3. The proposed 2,000 houses to be built at Wisley and the 2,000 at Burpham would make Send an impossible place to live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2829   Respondent: 10721089 / Y Beraud   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note I wish to object to Travellers Plots on this site. The access for such large vehicles would mean major road restructure and also additional roads which would only add to the current grid lock, pollution noise and stress being experienced by local residents and commuters.

Added to which the roads are not maintained in good order now meaning additional roads would suffer the same plight in years to come. No proven demand.

I object to 400 homes being built at Garlick's Arch as this would mean another thousand vehicles accessing the local roads again causing grid lock, pollution noise and stress.

I object to this development as it will combine the villages of Send and Ripley into one large urban sprawl without any proven "exceptional circumstances" necessitating the use of precious Green Belt land with abundant wild life.

I object on the grounds that previous objections have clearly been ignored.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3034   Respondent: 10721121 / L Beraud   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because there is no proven demand for a TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLES PLOTS ON THIS LOCATION. This site is beautiful PERMANENT GREEN BELT and no EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXIST it is EQUISITE ANCIENT WOODLAND THAT EXISTED AT THE TIME OF ELIZABETH 1. This Policy will join up the villages of Ripley and Send and will Defeat the KEY PURPOSE OF THE GREEN BELT. The land in question is subject to Frequent Flooding and is currently a Flood 2 Allocation and also is Contaminated by Lead Shot accumulated over fifty years. The Excessive Traffic that will be Generate will Block the already exceptional busy Local Roads of Send and Ripley. This POLICY IGNORES all the Thousands of Previous objections made by Local PEOPLE.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4011  Respondent: 10721473 / David French  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy 43 Land at Garlick's Arch –400 houses, industrial buildings and slip roads on and off the A3. It is ridiculous to build 400 houses between Ripley and Send. It would join up the villages and increase the traffic through them so much. Industrial buildings could be built on the Burnt Common site or at Slyfield. The proposed slip roads would bring vast numbers of cars and lorries through Send, Old Woking, Clandon and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3534  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was brought to our attention at the very last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation with the residents and is not required in terms of housing need by either the village or the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3536  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Should there be a credible need for this space, it should be located at Slyfield where there is already an industrial estate and there is a 40ha site available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3537  Respondent: 10721537 / Stephen Niblett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. Additionally this site is also at risk of flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8071  Respondent: 10722049 / Richard Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because of the extra traffic that it will generate by building 400 new homes.

I travel past that area every day into Ripley and already the traffic build up can sometimes come right back to the new Waitrose on the roundabout. Ideally there should be a slip road made so that traffic coming from the south side of Ripley, Send and Clandon etc can go onto the A3 to London without having to pass through Ripley.

Also the land is Green Belt and for some reason Send is taking on a lot of development of new homes without the amenities to support it. It is already difficult to get Doctor’s appointments and the schools are full. I don’t understand why Guildford Borough Council feels it can build on Green Belt land when many of the residents, like myself, live here due to the countryside feel of the area and the village feel of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to huge development at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common. This is another development just slipped in without the necessary consultation. The roads around the area are already blocked during rush hour periods and they are not built to cope with the amount of heavy traffic already using them. Apart from a major junction at Burnt Common there does not appear to be any further improvement to the roads in the area. The A3 is already grid locked North and South Daily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to policy A43 change at Garlicks' Arch. As it ignores all previous objections. There is no demand for travellers plots in this area. You will destroy ancient woodland which we as a county are supposed to be preserving. It is Green belt and is a flood two zone allocation. Where is all the traffic going to go.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/608  Respondent: 10722689 / D.M. Johnson-Webb  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch.

1) It ignores all previous objections.
2) There is no demand for Travellers plots.
3) You will destroy Ancient woodland.
4) It is Green Belt and flood zone allocation.
5) Where will the subsequent traffic go.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5778  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlicks Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7545  Respondent: 10723553 / Judith Pound  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlick’s Arch – the surrounding roads do not have the capacity for the associated increased traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it is blatant destruction of Green Belt land, where there are no exceptional circumstances for this development to be allowed. It will mean that the villages of Ripley and Send are virtually joined up, which goes against the whole purpose of the Green Belt, which is supposed to be retained. The number of houses proposed is excessive and it will create massive levels of traffic that the roads cannot cope with (particularly with the ever increasing incidents on the A3 that cause traffic from there to divert to our local roads). The huge numbers of objections already made by local people have clearly not been listened to. Also this area floods easily and this would be made worse by building on it as a great deal of natural soakaway ability would be lost and in addition the land is contaminated with lead shot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. It was a very late inclusion into the 2016 plan. No prior consultation was held with the residents of Send Marsh. This will increase the village by 25% and is not needed.

I object that ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century will be removed. How can you even contemplate cutting these down!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3197  Respondent: 10724769 / P. Broughton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available and where developers are anxious to create this type of building.

I object that 4 businesses employing a number of people will be forced off the land against their will.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1319  Respondent: 10724897 / Hilary Sewter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to this Policy A43 at Garlick’s Arch because:

- The Local Plan H1 states that “Gipsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 houses or more where there remains an identified need”. Send has been disproportionately allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as all 8 showpeople plots, identified as needed in the borough until 2034. The developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden Hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches apiece during the same period.
- This Policy ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
- The area is currently a floodZone 2 allocation and really is subject to frequent flooding.
- It will generate excessive traffic that will gridlock the local roads of Send and Ripley.

Abide by the already agreed Policy A43 page 144

The proposed changes to the agreed Policy are not legally compliant, neither are they sound and nor do they comply with the duty to co-operate.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Abide by the already agreed Policy A43 page 144
The proposed changes to the agreed Policy are not legally compliant, neither are they sound and nor do they comply with the duty to co-operate.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4086  Respondent: 10725345 / T. Sharman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object also to the overdevelopment of land at burnt common 400 houses and 7000sq m of industry and warehousing this is unnecessary over development also it is alongside the very busy and noisy A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2232  Respondent: 10725537 / D. Warriner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A43 Garlick's Arch. Has anyone considered the traffic problems this would be.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2209  Respondent: 10725729 / Annie Hotson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.
- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/ M25.
- I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2208  Respondent: 10725793 / Ken Hotson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.
- I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/ M25.
- I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1956  Respondent: 10726369 / A. Watson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I write to object to plans in the above policy because again you have not listened to the hundreds of objections put to you last year, and you have increased the number of houses and included six sites for travelling showpeople. You have shown no evidence of the need for these sites on a beautiful Green Belt location and where you are required to show exceptional circumstances. This is gross over development of our village with an excessive number of homes for a village. There is beautiful ancient woodland at the site which has been there since the time of Elizabeth 1 and will join up Ripley and Send thereby defeating the purpose of the Green Belt. An additional 400 houses will cripple the roads around Ripley and Send and contaminate surrounding homes with noxious fumes from congested traffic. I am informed that there is lead shot accumulated over 50 years at the site which, as a parent, I would not want my children to live with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1223  Respondent: 10726497 / David Ian Ness  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
• I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch
• This also ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for ‘Travelling Showpeople Plots’
• It is sited on ancient woodland going back to Elizabethan Times
• It is a flood zone 2 allocation, and very prone to flooding in the winter months
• There will be an increase of an estimated 1000 vehicles trying to access the A3 and the A247. This increase in traffic would be linked to the proposed building plan for Wisley Airfield (600 homes +) creating a massive increase is the volume of traffic using the A3.
• Has any consideration been given to the number of fatal and serious accidents occurring regularly on the A3. If we were looking at the same amount of murders in the area what would be the result

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/953</th>
<th>Respondent: 10726561 / L. Boyle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Garlick's Arch Policy A43, Policy A44 1.9ha. Policy 42. I object with the following points on these policies:

1. The building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick's Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. Garlick's Arch has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

2. The development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

3. The proposed industrial development of7,000 sq mat Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

4. To building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the new marina will generate heavy traffic too. The lane and the main A247 road cannot take any more.

5. To the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.
6. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/214</th>
<th>Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the proposed development of Land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common. Policy A43

I object to the encroachment on ancient woodland. Policy A43

I object to the proposed 7000 sq. m. industrial development at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common. Policy A43

I object to the development of the proposed new 4-way interchange from the A3 at Burnt Common. Policy A43

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/399</th>
<th>Respondent: 10727009 / A. Elms</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the publication 'About Guildford' it is stated that 'less than 700 homes per year will be built in total'. Why are most of these homes being built in the Send Area? There are brown field sites which could be developed elsewhere, rather than in our beautiful Green Belt area around Send.

Why has Garlick's Arch suddenly been included at the last minute in the Development Plan? This doesn't match with the statement 'Only 1.6% of greenfield land will be taken and allocated for development' (again in the publication 'About Guildford'). No time has been given for adequate consultation here and it has not been included in previous consultations.

Is all the greenfield land coming from the Send and Ripley area?

The NPPF prevents the merging of settlements without any exceptions. Why has this been proposed?

I object to the proposed development of Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common.

Policy A43

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the encroachment on ancient woodland. Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial and Warehouse Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why has industrial and warehouse space of 7000 sq. m. been proposed? There is room at Slyfield which should be fully developed to prevent proliferation of industrial areas in the Surrey Countryside. Keep them all on one site. Traffic would be intolerable for the residents in the Send area. The nature of the village of Send would be irrevocably changed by so much traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed 7000 sq. m. industrial development at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common. Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3991  Respondent: 10728321 / Michael Randles  Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| I OBJECT TO the 400 houses proposed at Garlick's Arch and Industrial site. This seems an excessive number of houses (plus the others already mentioned). The doctors' surgery is working to full capacity and appointments are a problem already. The new school being built will take the pupils from the present two schools but cannot possibly cope with the great number of children expected from so many new homes. This site is also new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. The site is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF. Ancient trees c1600 AD would be endangered. Large industrial space can be provided at Slyfield. |
| In conclusion, some new affordable homes would be welcomed in Send but the huge numbers proposed would overwhelm the already stretched infrastructure available, whether surgery, schools or narrow roads which would become completely gridlocked. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |

---

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/3863  Respondent: 10728353 / Pat Randles  Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| I OBJECT TO the 400 houses proposed at Garlick's Arch and Industrial site. This seems an excessive number of houses (plus the others already mentioned). The doctors' surgery is working to full capacity and appointments are a problem already. The new school being built will take the pupils from the present two schools but cannot possibly cope with the great number of children expected from so many new homes. This site is also new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. The site is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF. Ancient trees c1600 AD would be endangered. Large industrial space can be provided at Slyfield. |
| In conclusion, some new affordable homes would be welcomed in Send but the huge numbers proposed would overwhelm the already stretched infrastructure available, whether surgery, schools or narrow roads which would become completely gridlocked. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| **Attached documents:** |
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2522  Respondent: 10728449 / Jean Croucher  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object:

1. The land is green belt It is a rural area and has not previously been built on.
2. The large number of houses would put pressure on already very overcrowded local roads
3. During rush hour the roads around Burntcommon already have extremely lengthy traffic queues. A new interchange for the A3 would make traffic problems much worse.
4. This is an important conservation area and contains areas of ancient woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3031  Respondent: 10729281 / Richard Croxford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Gatlicks Arch (policy e 3). This site was included very late into the proposals, and I believe that the commercial needs-if true-could be catered for elsewhere (such as near Slyfield), The proposed amount of residential dwellings is excessive, and the site is clearly within the current Green Belt.

I object to the proposal for a new 4-way entry/exit slip-road (for A3 access) at Burnt Common (policy A43a). This would place enormous pressure on local roads and highways, and Send resident's-have already suffered a great deal in recent times with traffic congestion. Many residents fear that Send Road will become bogged down with additional traffic as a result of the various proposals (Wisley airfield, Garlick’ s Arch, Merrow and Burpham).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/218  Respondent: 10729473 / P.T. Elms  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to policy A43 involving Garlick’s Arch (38ha), Burnt Common (400 houses and 7000 sq. m. of industrial and warehousing). This site is new and was not included in Regulation 18! It is Green Belt under NPPF protection.

I object that GBC have shown little sign of common decency and humanity towards us, the citizens of Send who pay rates to GBC which should be remembered!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4007  Respondent: 10729537 / Julia Osborn  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 policy change to include six travellers plots as the inclusion of traveller pitches is unnecessary according to the level set within the plan, Policy H1, 4.2.24 states that travel accommodation is required in developments of 500 homes or more to provide mixed communities; and Send has already been designated for travellers pitches in the 2016 draft of the Plan.

I also reiterate my objection in 2016 to A43, Land at Garlick’s Arch that this is overdevelopment. The Settlement Hierarchy 2014 classified Send as a large village but representations on behalf of Send Parish Council by Tibbalds Urban Planning and Design (2016) paragraphs 3.1 to 3.4 set out that this classification of Send as a large village only occurred due to the proximity if the Send Services to Burnt Common. As stated in paragraph 3.2 of Tibbalds (2016) submission has this not be the case then Send would have been classified a ‘Medium’ village and medium villages are “unsuitable for substantial growth but are capable of taking appropriate residential infill and development to meet local needs."

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2278  Respondent: 10729857 / Lynne Daniel  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the development at Garlicks Arch of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space, as although the plan mentions a new roundabout to access the A3 in both directions, at Burnt Common, the residents of Garlicks Arch will need to access the new roundabout via the Portsmouth Road and the current roundabout outside the Shell/Waitrose garage. This roundabout and the surrounding road routes are unsuitable for additional heavy vehicles

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1290  Respondent: 10731233 / Linda Aris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the late inclusion of Garlick's Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3411  Respondent: 10731233 / Linda Aris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It will join up Ripley and Send.

It is a flood zone.

It is ignoring thousands of previous objections.

There is no proven need and demand for traveller showpeople plots in this area.

The increased number of homes is excessive.

It is a clear failure of proper planning process.

Area has been targeted disproportionately.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4157  Respondent: 10731265 / Liz Turner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick's Arch (policy A43)

This proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq.m employment space (light industrial/storage, warehousing) on Green Belt land which lies outside the Send Marsh Burnt Common village boundary includes ancient woodland which provides a refuge for deer and other wildlife. This site has never been proposed as a Potential Development Area before and in fact your Council refused an application by 'Oldlands' to build 25 houses on part of this site just 2 years ago.

Development here would be totally inappropriate. It is Green Belt open farmland and the village has no infrastructure to support it. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just shop (Waitrose), no doctors' surgery, no schools and the local roads are already congested. The housing, proposal alone would add 960 to the existing population of 2,341, an increase of 41% and would lead to at least an extra 800 cars on our crowded roads.

The proposed light industrial/storage facility is totally inappropriate and the whole development would destroy the village's demarcation from Ripley, creating urban sprawl.
In my view, this late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals has resulted in a completely new Plan and has rendered the previous consultation worthless.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5415  Respondent: 10731329 / Sheila Hookins  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5794  Respondent: 10731361 / Joan Bagnall  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly, Guildford Borough Council have not provided any evidence for the need of such a huge number of houses to be built in the area.

Thirdly, the former revised Local Plan put forward earlier this summer made a modest provision for housing and industrial development at Burnt Common on what is more or less a brown field site. I object to the current proposal to develop the Garlick's Arch site with 400 houses and industrial space. There is ancient woodland on this site which would be affected even if it were not built over. Industrial units would not provide job opportunities for local people but bring further traffic into the area including heavy vehicles. The building of this volume of housing would increase the volume of traffic on all the surrounding roads which are already hopelessly congested especially during peak hours. The stream which runs across this site and under the Portsmouth Road has flooded on at least two occasions since we have lived in the area. The local infrastructure cannot accommodate the increase in the number of inhabitants in local schools, the provision of medical care or shops.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch as this will cause over development of Send village. The number of homes is excessive and it ignores all previous concerns raised with regard to the effect on the local infrastructure. It ignores the preservation of ancient woodland and the green buffer this site creates between the current residential area and the busy A3 road. It also ignores the flooding which occurs from the stream.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/223  Respondent: 10731585 / Robert Thompson  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6321  Respondent: 10731937 / Carol Mullan  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the development at Garlick Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1104  Respondent: 10731937 / Carol Mullan  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6240</th>
<th>Respondent: 10731969 / Tony Mason</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A34 Garlick’s Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5043</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732097 / Gillian Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development at Garlick Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I object to the development at Garlick Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5044</th>
<th>Respondent: 10732097 / Gillian Thomas</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it will cause severe congestion in Send and adjacent areas which are already very busy and I am not convinced it is needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and industrial development because it was so suddenly proposed by Guildford Borough Council, without following the accepted guidelines. It is also a site with ancient woodland which should be protected at all cost.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3867  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object in particular to the proposal to build on Green Belt land in Send and Ripley at Garlick's Arch. It is not justified by any special circumstances or evidence of demand. There is absolutely no way that the building of some 400 houses and the allocation of 7,000 square metres of industrial land at Garlick's Arch can be justified, especially when there is brownfield space nearby and at the Slyfield industrial estate. This site is inappropriate because public transport there is wholly inadequate. It is liable to frequent flooding as happened again only recently. The Environment Agency has assessed the site as being at high risk of flooding. It has Ancient Woodland, including more than 80 ancient oak trees, and much wildlife. It would change the area from rural or at least semi-rural to suburban. There are no plans to improve local schools, medical facilities or utilities to cope with the extra population. Traffic would be virtually impossible both as there are already considerable delays on the road into Ripley, on the Guildford by-pass as is well-known, and along Send Road even without the imminent combining of both the present Send Schools. The proposal to build 400 houses at Garlick's Arch would double the number of houses in this area and thus alter very much for the worse the nature of this historic area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2414  Respondent: 10732193 / Leslie Bowerman  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because the proposal ignores all the thousands of objections made by local people and makes things much worse by including even more houses, which looks like a punishment of local people having the temerity to object.

I object because there is no proven demand for travelling show-people in this location.

I object because this site is beautiful Green Belt land and there are no exceptional circumstances to merit removing this protection.

I object because it is grossly excessive development of our village and the number of houses proposed is overwhelmingly too many.

I object because this is a site of wonderful ancient woodland that dates back to medieval times.

I object because this proposal will connect Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Belt.
I object because the site often floods and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.

I object because the site is contaminated with lead shot which has been accumulating for 50 years.

I object because the enormous amount of traffic which will be generated by this proposal will catastrophically clog up the roads of both Send and Ripley, many of which can barely take two lines of traffic. It will also make the clogging up of the nearby Guildford By-pass disastrously worse. One wonders whether the proposers of this policy ever use the by-pass, particularly travelling south, when bottle-necking can extend right to Burpham even on an ordinary weekday.

I object because potential obrectors have never been shown the figures on which the proposed number of additional houses is based and which can only be of benefit to those who stand to profit from such proposals. Justice must not only be done but must be visibly and manifestly be seen to be done, which is not possible without seeing the figures on which the proposal is based.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2289  Respondent: 10733089 / Chris Barber  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

• I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch of 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial space, as although the plan mentions a new roundabout to access the A3 in both directions, at Burnt Common, the residents of Garlick’s Arch will need to access the new roundabout via the Portsmouth Road and the current roundabout outside the Shell/Waitrose garage. This roundabout and the surrounding road routes are unsuitable for additional heavy vehicles

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? 

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/95  Respondent: 10733409 / Ruth Hunter  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I would like to register my objection to the final draft local plan.

I would like my objection to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

Removing Send and Ripley from GREENBELT would be disastrous for communities and nature. Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch in particular must be rejected.

The boundaries between Ripley - Send - Woking - Guildford have been straining for some time but there are tiny pockets of GREENBELT between them that just about keep precious village life and conservation of our flora and fauna alive.
The policy A43 would demolish this - and to hold the responsibility for this is a great burden - I urge you to be strong and sensible and protect the history and nature and soul of our community.

Precious woodland and wildlife would be lost forever. The traffic congestion is already very difficult in peak hours - there are a large number of elderly people and families with young children in the area. Giving permission for this proposal would not only endanger the lives of residents, but ruin the village communities of Ripley and Send and Burnt Common.

The noise of traffic from A3 already intrusive but with a new interchange it would be unbearable and not healthy to live with.

If any warehousing is really necessary then Slyfield is the much more logical option.

Garlick's Arch contains ancient woodland and rare and precious wildlife. Nesting birds not commonly seen in the South East. We have flora and fauna to be proud of and it is ours and your duty to protect it. To keep this community safe. There is neither the need nor infrastructure to support a housing development of this magnitude.

GBC have not been honest and some council members downright underhand.

I would certainly question the motives and morality of Councillors Spooner in the proceedings as I know many people do.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I would like to register my objection to the final draft local plan.

I would like my objection to be seen by the Planning Inspector.

Removing Send and Ripley from GREENBELT would be disastrous for communities and nature. Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch in particular must be rejected.

The boundaries between Ripley - Send - Woking - Guildford have been straining for some time but there are tiny pockets of GREENBELT between them that just about keep precious village life and conservation of our flora and fauna alive.

The policy A43 would demolish this - and to hold the responsibility for this is a great burden - I urge you to be strong and sensible and protect the history and nature and soul of our community.

Precious woodland and wildlife would be lost forever. The traffic congestion is already very difficult in peak hours - there are a large number of elderly people and families with young children in the area. Giving permission for this proposal would not only endanger the lives of residents, but ruin the village communities of Ripley and Send and Burnt Common.

The noise of traffic from A3 already intrusive but with a new interchange it would be unbearable and not healthy to live with.

If any warehousing is really necessary then Slyfield is the much more logical option.
Garlick's Arch contains ancient woodland and rare and precious wildlife. Nesting birds not commonly seen in the South East. We have flora and fauna to be proud of and it is ours and your duty to protect it. To keep this community safe. There is neither the need nor infrastructure to support a housing development of this magnitude.

GBC have not been honest and some council members downright underhand.

I would certainly question the motives and morality of Councillors Spooner in the proceedings as I know many people do.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1566  **Respondent:** 10733409 / Ruth Hunter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I strongly object to the Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch. When the last policy was proposed, thousands of us objected and the Council have showed contempt for us by expanding the new proposal to include more homes, industrial warehousing and Travelling Showpeople plots. This greed and disrespect for residents and our precious Greenbelt is disgusting and I hope very much the planning inspector will reject their proposal.

Burnt Common and Garlick's Arch are beautiful permanent Green belt with ancient woodland and wonderful wildlife that we need to preserve for future generations.

The area is subject to flooding and proposal A43 will cause over development as the number of homes is quite excessive. It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1681  **Respondent:** 10733665 / David Elvey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the development of Garlick's Arch site (Policy A43) as it includes ancient woodland, is in Green Belt protected by NPPF, and is subject to flooding.
2. I object to the development at Garlick's Arch site of 7,000sq. m. for industry and warehousing as the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows an 80% reduction from previous draft plan.
3. I object to the development at Garlick's Arch site of 400 houses as it will cause further traffic stress at Burnt Common and put additional pressures on local infrastructure, doctors and schools

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6647  **Respondent:** 10733825 / Karen Thornton  **Agent:**
I object to 400 houses and 7000 sq meters if industrial space at garlic field

It floods really badly and is covered by ancient woodland. There is no need to build an industrial site here when there are plenty of other sites in Guildford
e.g. Slyfield. There are plenty of brown field sites that can be built on therefore there is no need to build on Greenbelt. Also Guildford's housing requirements have been exaggerated but they won't disclose their calculations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6649  Respondent: 10733825 / Karen Thornton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common, if this happened Send would have to take on the traffic from the proposed 2,000 at Gosden Hill, 2,000 at Wisely Airfield and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. There will be a huge amount of increased traffic going through Send as people use it to get to and from the A3 and the M25, Guildford and Woking. This would mean gridlock on an already overloaded road. Noise and pollution levels would be made a lot worse,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1844  Respondent: 10733921 / Pamela Maynard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 which now refers to 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. Despite the thousands of objections already lodged, this number of dwellings on beautiful Green Belt is obscene and who has suddenly decided that there is a need for Travelling Showpeople plots? Ripley and Send will merge into one another and our villages with much historical background, will fade into non-existence.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6131  Respondent: 10734113 / A.H. Finn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. meters of industrial space at Garlic’s Arch. The industrial space is not needed in this area. I do not believe the is the demand for this number of houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6832</th>
<th>Respondent: 10735777 / S. May</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3442</th>
<th>Respondent: 10736545 / Patricia Midson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to Garlick Arch. The site floods and it is covered by ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2872</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741729 / Jean Page</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A 43 because:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This land is part of the permanent Green Belt and no evidence of “exceptional circumstances” has been demonstrated which justify the change of use of greenbelt land. If I am wrong please advise me on the “exceptional circumstances” which exist. This area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. Historically it has existed as an ancient woodland since the time of Elizabeth 1. Are you suggesting that we totally disregard our English heritage for the sake of building homes on an area which already suffers from frequent flooding and for which there is no proven need for them to be built? Flooding is not only devastating for those it affects but has the knock on effect of additional costs to the local authority as well as insurance companies and it is the taxpayer who ends up footing the bill. This area is already overloaded by traffic and the additional homes and sites which are proposed will only add to traffic congestion and block up even further the roads of Send and Ripey. I require to see the evidence that indicates that there is a demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition of 400 homes will seriously cause over-development of the villages of Ripley and Send, in effect joining them and defeating the key purpose of the green belt. The issue also remains of the inability of the current infrastructure i.e. schools, GP’s and hospitals to cope with this influx of additional people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/508</th>
<th>Respondent: 10741793 / Dianne Mathie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is definitely not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. So what are the justifications?

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. Please explain.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding. Please do not destroy 16th century trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1564  Respondent: 10742753 / Debbie Leane  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. If such industrial areas are necessary then this should be extension of the industrial space at Slyfield not in Send. Guildford council has also refused to disclose their calculations for the current demand for extra housing and I believe these 400 houses are not an essential requirement for this specific area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1589  Respondent: 10742753 / Debbie Leane  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because this area of Green Belt is incredibly beautiful, consisting of ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to ‘prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness’. This area separates our two villages and therefore should be protected. I feel the objections from Send and Ripley residents are just being ignored again!! Furthermore, there is no evidence that Travelling Showpeople plots are needed in this area. Such development will only increase traffic around our village that is currently, during various times of the day, incredibly busy already. It is fundamentally wrong for our village to have to carry the burden of such an excessive number of houses which would only lead to one large conurbation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/132  Respondent: 10746209 / Pauline Fava  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The land at Garlick's Arch recently added to the plan is of ancient woodland. Surely of great value from a conservation and aesthetic aspect and like the green belt once built on is lost forever. These are are valuable assets helping to fight poor air quality.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3496  **Respondent:** 10749409 / B. Holmes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Garlic Arch Development - 400 Houses etc

I object to the proposed plan and set out below some of the reasons. This is Green Belt and should remain so.

As set out in the *National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Sect 9.80*, Green Belt serves several purposes including:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from

There are no very special circumstances to allow such a development to take place on this site.

I fully endorse the Send Parish Council's response to this proposal.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2951  **Respondent:** 10749409 / B. Holmes  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send.

Allocation - 400 Homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots

I object to this policy and comment on the amendments only in this instance as requested (my previous comments from the 2016 consultation still apply).

I fail to see what exceptional circumstances exist to provide travelling showpeople such plots on Green Belt land and, coupled with the proposed homes allocation, create an urban sprawl in contravention of NPPF section 9.80.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1672  Respondent: 10750337 / Veronica Kean  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the construction of 400 houses and industrial space at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. This site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. If the site does not act as a natural flood plain the flood water will cause flooding in other residential areas. More houses will also mean more traffic congestion, more pressure on the Villages medical centre and more pressure on school places.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/180  Respondent: 10750593 / Jo Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Once again I am compelled to write to you to raise objections regarding the local plan. I find it exasperating that I continuously have to raise objections to a local plan which demonstrates an absolute failure of a proper planning process. You have not made any attempt to mitigate and or amend the plan despite the significant volume of objections to the 2016 plan. Indeed Guildford Borough Council has made the situation even worse by combining proposals around Garlick’s Arch and Burnt common and not altering the proposals based on previous objections.

I object to the proposals to build 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots on the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43, for the following reasons:

- Thousands of objections have been raised on this previously, this is in complete disregard to all previous objections
- There is no evidence of a demand to house travelling show people in this location,[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
- The land is in the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist
- The number of homes is excessive ensuring complete over development of the village. There would be no definition of villages between Ripley & Send defeating the purpose of the Green Belt
- Infrastructure cannot support this. Traffic and pollution levels are already a major problem, schools and medical facilities, as required by law, are already over stretched
- The land is an ancient woodland that existed back in the reign of Elizabeth 1
- The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation, drainage remains substandard
- Due to local shooting facilities, the land is contaminated by lead shot

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A43 (building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch). The site is covered by ancient woodland which must be protected and not destroyed for development purposes. The industrial space is not needed in this area. The housing proposal is excessive and brown field sites must be used as a first priority.

This proposal would create traffic congestion, pollution and an industrial area will generate unacceptable levels of heavy traffic through Send Village this would irrevocably damage the area and environment. Send must not become a Local Rural Centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to some other sites in the local plan namely Garlick's Arch and West Horsley. These sites are out of proportion to the surrounding area and none qualify for the exceptional circumstances required to take them out of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. No consultation took place on this, and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3178  Respondent: 10756449 / Richard and Valerie Overton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2476  Respondent: 10756641 / Jo Murray  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 Garlick's Arch

I object to the change of Policy A43 because it completely ignores the thousands of objections made by local residents to the previous draft local plan!

I object to the change of Policy A43 because the Green Belt was put in place to keep our villages, Ripley & Send, separate - this Policy defeats that purpose and there is no local need to build on this gorgeous Green Belt land of ours - and no exceptional circumstances apply.

I object to the change of Policy A43 because the number of homes is excessive and will cause over-development of the local area.

I object to the change of Policy A43 because the local infrastructure is already stretched to the limits, particularly local roads at rush hour.

I object to the change of Policy A43 because there are numerous environmental reasons why it is inappropriate, including: the area is ancient woodland, it floods frequently

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2811  Respondent: 10756961 / Carol Marsh  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Site A43 Garlicks Arch

- Housing at this site would be on Greenbelt land.

- The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon, and will cause coalescence of these villages.

- The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation. The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act...
2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4099  Respondent: 10764385 / E.E Whearley  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

9) I object to the development of Garlick's Arch, it is Green Belt and historic woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/461  Respondent: 10764385 / E.E Whearley  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A43 changes at Garlicks Arch because:

1. No exceptional circumstances exist to lose Green Belt Land.
2. This wood dates from the time of Elizabeth 1st and should not be lost in the time of Elizabeth 2nd.
3. No special circumstances exist to justify 400 homes and 6 travelling showpeople plots.
4. Valuable Green Belt land sustains village life, prides area of natural beauty and defines villages, we do not want to become suburbs of Guildford or Woking.
5. The traffic situation of key times is a major problem in both Send and Ripley. Such a massive development will increase the problem enormously.
6. There is no proof of such a large increase in demand for housing in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6017  Respondent: 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2094  Respondent: 10765249 / Andy & Sonja Freebody  Agent:
Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the surrounding villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh / Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I would like to raise my objection to the revised local plan:

- A43 Garlick’s Arch and the addition of 8 Travelling pitches, is there actually a requirement in the local area?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the
woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The
development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The
Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services
such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any
residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4440  Respondent: 10773153 / Miles Palmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and
ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes
per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land
requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt
Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at
every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of
the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by
National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy
walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but
to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore,
there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3311   Respondent: 10773409 / Anne Monk   Agent:
Document:    Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly, I object to policy A43 for the change at Garlicks arch for the following reasons. One: There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this area. Two: It will join Ripley up with Send, defeating the purpose of greenbelt, losing any sense of the traditional villages. Three- It is subject to frequent flooding- this land needs to be there to prevent issues flooding other houses downstream of the river. Four- It will create excessive traffic. Over the last 20 years the traffic has increased dramatically. If it continues to increase the whole area will become a permanently gridlocked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6513   Respondent: 10773441 / Barry Marshall   Agent:
Document:    Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7581</th>
<th>Respondent: 10773825 / Pierre Foskett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object to the late addition to site A43 at Garlicks Arch Burnt common for development in the Guildford local plan. This is completely unacceptable. It has been submitted late without prior consultation and is simply catastrophic for the area. The proposal is on an unacceptable scale for Send and Ripley villages to remain sustainable. The idea that that access to the A3 would be permitted is a total disaster for the whole area, Send is a settlement predominantly based along the main road of the village – Send Road. If there was access to the A3 at Garlick’s Arch, Send Road would become intolerably congested, unhealthy and unsafe. The A247 already has Send and Clandon schools located dangerously alongside, increases in traffic would risk serious harm to our children. Also the proposal for development on this site is far too large for the area of Send and Ripley to sustain, it will remove ancient woodland within greenbelt and essentially merge the two distinct villages which is the entire essence of greenbelt. Furthermore the local facilities, including, roads, sewerage and school provision are entirely unable to sustain such a development. The proposed size of developments in the plan is incredible; given NPPF 9, “moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature” and NPPF 14, “any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5726</th>
<th>Respondent: 10774145 / P Jordan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Specific objections to Policy A43 and A43a: Garlick’s Arch / Burnt Common / North Facing Slip Roads:

The proposal is for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing space. I object to this proposal on the basis of the following:

- This site has appeared very recently, it was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has not previously been consulted upon

- It falls within green belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents merging of settlements

- The site is particularly sensitive from a conservation stand point, as it has ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century

- This will add significant traffic to the local road infrastructure around Send and Send Marsh; these roads are already heavily over loaded, and there is no space to widen given the residential surrounds

No amount of expert studies can replace personal experience; I urge anyone considering these proposals to try and travel on the A247 road through Send at peak times to see how impossible it already is to travel between the A3 and Woking. The B368 through Send Marsh is used as an alternative when the A247 is overloaded, and this will become the next constraint. The surrounding proposed developments such as Gosden Hill Farm will without doubt also want to use the slip road and increase traffic through these already constrained and overloaded village roads.

- Services such as doctors are already overloaded in the Send / Send Marsh / Ripley area. It is close to impossible to get a doctor’s appointment within a 3 – 4 day window at the Villages Medical Practice as it stands with current population; where has this been considered, what is the plan to provide services to this significant addition of people?

- Flood risk: Over recent years the flooding in Send Marsh has become progressively worse with changing weather conditions. As example I quote winter of 2013 / 2014. Adding such as significant amount of development can only make this situation more severe.

- Nature of the village will be forever changed; Send and Send Marsh will no longer be rural villages given the scale of this development.

If there is a need for more industrial space (which I still question particularly in light of Brexit), then why would this not be an extension of the existing Slyfield Industrial Estate?

I trust my objections will be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1729  Respondent: 10774881 / Kate Cheyne  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

This again is an increase in number of houses and now inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots.

1. This is an area with prolific birds and wildlife
2. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
3. It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” have been stated or proven
4. Separation of villages is a key objective of the green belt. This development will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt.
5. It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation; I personally experienced this during heavy rains on recent years where the entire area is left flooded for days afterward.
6. It will generate excessive traffic in an area that is already struggling to cope with the volume of cars on the road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2394  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regards to Policy A 43,t object to the fact that this new site at Garlick's Arch was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and so has not been consulted on previously. This is, surely, wrong. How can you justify this?

I object to the proposed development of land at Garlick's Arch for housing and industrial use. We actually need 800 new homes in Guildford although Guildford Borough Council have suggested an outrageous figure of 13,860. There is no need whatsoever to develop Green Belt land, which includes significantly important woodland, to build yet another 400 homes.

I object to the proposal for 7,000 square metres of industrial use and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. It is simply not required, as the ELNA 2015 shows an 80% reduction in employment floor space since the previous assessment. If there is a need in Guildford there are previously approved plans for industrial use at Slyfield where existing infrastructure can support the development. If the Garlick's Arch development went ahead this would include a new 4-way junction with the A3 at Burnt Common that Send Village simply couldn't cope with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2406  Respondent: 10775137 / Wendy Lodge  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and Guildford has more than enough traveller plots.

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist to allow development on it. Almost every week in the media Government Ministers state that the Green Belt must be protected and only developed where overarchong need is proved and yet Guildford Borough Council seem determined to destroy this area of ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1.

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt. It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. It is
contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years. It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1054  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses, which was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation. This has been quite disgraceful. Also this proposed development is simply not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq mat Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which have existed since the 16th century would be endangered. The site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt, with is protected under the National Policy Framework. It also represents an unrestricted sprawl and goes against the purposes of the Green Belt which include the prevention of merging towns and settlements. Oh yes, and the site is also subject to flooding!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1987  Respondent: 10776033 / Prue Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43
I object most strongly to the changes made to Policy A43
These are my reasons:
It appears from the changes you have made to the proposal for homes and Travelling Showpeople plots that you have totally ignored the tens of thousands of previsous objections made by local people. What exactly are the 'exceptional circumstances' you claim exist? Please would you clearly define these? Six Travelling Showpeople plots is excessive and unprecedented especially as there is no proven demand for any whatsoever in this location. Garlick's Arch is a permanent and lovely Green Belt piece of ancient woodland that has existed since the 16th century. Apart from the loss of this unique area of woodland and the fact the Ripley and Send will effectively be joined and therefore defeat the key purpose of Green Belt, this area is subject to frequent flooding and has been given a 'flood zone 2' allocation. Added to this high risk of flooding there is accumulated lead shot in this particular area and it is therefore contaminated. The revised plan for 400 homes will cause an immense over-development of our village - this number of new homes is excessive. Will our doctors' surgeries be able to cope with the demand from the proposed number of new residents or the local schools be
able to offer places for the children? Very importantly, the additional traffic that your proposed plans/amended plans
would generate would be excessive. There are noticeable rush hours here with to the M25 - I am sure plan would cause heavy
roads in the area at least stationary traffic and queues that stretch from Old Woking you must be aware of this current
situation. Your changed traffic for many hours each day and totally gridlock all the twice daily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4962  
Respondent: 10780929 / Naren Nanda  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c),
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly
acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper c onsultation-in-relatlon to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and
replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004,
which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for
this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all,so
there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services
in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to
offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There
are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders
(Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the
woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The
development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The
Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services
such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/296  Respondent: 10781505 / Donna Joyce  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to you to voice my objection to the new revised local plan in my area, Policy A43 Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh.

I strongly object for the following reasons:

1. It seems that even thou there was huge outcry from local residents the last time this was proposed the council have blatantly ignored the feelings of the locals here who already have to deal on a daily basis with increased traffic issues, noise and pollution.
2. The council both at local level and Surrey county council cannot maintain the roads that exist already there is an accident waiting to happen at the end of Send Marsh road at the junction with The old Portsmouth road this junction is always busy every morning with increased traffic from a new development this situation will be even worse than it is already.
3. Send Marsh is a little development in its own right! A new development will merge us with Send on one side and Ripley on the other, We will lose our identity.
4. Ancient woodland CANNOT EVER EVER BE REPLACED!!!
5. Travellers! There are plenty of sites up and down the country that can accommodate Travelling show people ( if they actually still exist?). I see no reason for any Traveller plots to be made available, This to my mind is an excuse by the council to make provision for a Gypsy site.
6. I am sure that you hear on a daily basis about the squeeze on services, Well just to confirm if you need to see your GP it is true you do need to book your illness six weeks in advance,
7. I am also convinced that these homes will NOT BE AFFORDABLE TO THE AVERAGE PERSON! This is of course on Ripley's doorstep and we all know that it is more expensive than the average area with regard to property prices, Estate agents and builders will have a certain way of pushing up the prices.
8. Flooding in and around Ripley and all along The Send marsh road are a huge problem during spells of heavy and prolonged rainfall, I am quite sure that as with other developments throughout the years no thought or provision is made for our drain and sewer networks
9. All in All to go ahead with any of these proposals all up and down the A3 corridor would be a TOTAL DISASTER, not only for the already existing residents, but for wildlife, air quality, and general ease of life.
10. Send and Send Marsh and Ripley cannot take the extra strain and so I therefore ask that this objection be taken into accout!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6969  Respondent: 10782689 / Murray Dudgeon  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2939  Respondent: 10784769 / Jane Baker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43
Now 400 homes and six Travelling Show people plots.
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:

It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
There is no proven demand for Travellers' plots at this location.
It is an ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I.
It will join up Ripley and Send defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently flood zone 2 allocation.
It will generate excessive traffic onto already busy local roads in Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4262  Respondent: 10785633 / Penelope Eagle  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**I OBJECT** to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1574  **Respondent:** 10786113 / John Creasey  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I also OBJECT TO POLICY A43 change at Garlicks Arch because of the number of homes to be built despite previous objections. 6 plots for travelling show people is totally unnecessary as there is no proven demand. It will change the nature of Send and Ripley as two separate villages and will generate excessive amounts of traffic.

It is a flood risk area and is contaminated by lead shot.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2133  **Respondent:** 10788001 / William Williams  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the Garlicks Arch. Four hundrednew houses will overwhelm education and medical services in the Ripley - Send area

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4218  **Respondent:** 10789601 / Jennifer Hodgetts  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1605</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this plan. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial and warehousing. This is a site of local pride and interest. It includes ancient woodland and trees that should be protected, being 400 years old. There are already 13860 houses proposed by GBC. These plans were not included in the regulation 18 draft and should be declared invalid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/767</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793281 / Paul Woodington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly to the Policy A43 change at Garlick 's Arch because:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed number of 400 homes is excessive. We do not have the schools and medical services large enough to cope with this influx of at least another 800 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley and Send will be joined up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousands of previous objections have been blatently ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ancient woodland and needs to be protected at all costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and subject to frequent flooding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty years of shooting has resulted in contamination by lead shot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic in the area is already excessive, with long delays occurring in Send Marsh Road and Send Road at peak times. The proposed increase in housing will only exacerbate the situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2255</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793697 / Norman Carpenter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This development seems to be added without previous warning.</td>
<td>I OBJECT to the development as it captures even more GREEN BELT as do other policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As an ex-resident of [Response has been redacted due to statement containing personal data which cannot be disclosed due to the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998] (1968-1989) I was flooded twice and narrowly missed the flood on the third occasion. I realise new flooding relief was constructed remembering that the original flood water came from the 'GARLICK ARCH' side of the Portsmouth road- the building of a concrete town of 400 houses will ensure the accelerated run-off of storm water into the lower 'WIMPEY ESTATE'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL the above development will invariably increase the load on the schools and the medical facilities- already heavily overburdened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1288</th>
<th>Respondent: 10793697 / Norman Carpenter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this development (a) on personal experience of the 1968 Flooding (Resident 31 Maple RD (1968-1989) The extra floorspace, concrete, tarmac surface will ensure the accelerated runoff of storm water right to lower &quot;WIMPY ESTATE&quot;, as for the 8 travelling/ show people pitches – [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6895</th>
<th>Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/5073</th>
<th>Respondent: 10796417 / Richard Shenton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever.

2. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt.

3. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

4. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

5. Local roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). An example of severe congestion for much of the day is the Newark Road and
Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

6. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration of the road surfaces and additional parking problems.

7. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians and also bicycles, which have become a serious traffic issue since the Olympics.

8. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

9. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

10. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes.

11. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/396  Respondent: 10798049 / Steve & Maureen Knight  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Support. What about also using the land in Burnt Common between London Road and the A3 for additional development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3289  Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the new interchange on the A3 with Burnt Common because Send would have to take the traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and 1850 at Blackwell Farm. Much of this traffic to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford would go through Send. Send Barns Lane and Send Road are already overloaded, and quite often gridlocked during the morning and evening peak hours. This is would make this road impossible and would increase pollution and noise levels, which are already excessive. This must be avoided.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3309  Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford's housing needs have been grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2633  Respondent: 10798369 / Gail Hollis  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 Change at Garlick's Arch because:

1. a) It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
1. b) It will generate excessive traffic that will block the local roads in Send and Ripley
1. c) There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots on this location
1. d) It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
1. e) It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
1. f) It will join Ripley up with Send and defeat the object of the Green Belt
1. g) It is an exquisite ancient woodland that existed in the time of Elizabeth 1
1. h) It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently in a flood zone 2 allocation
1. i) The land has been contaminated by lead shot for over fifty years

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1183  Respondent: 10798977 / Ian Brooks  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch’

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

Moreover, the inclusion of the site A55 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch. The Borough Council’s reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 Plan were:

a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, ... (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did ”
b) The site [A43] provides the employmentfloorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore the Borough Council is not following their own guidelines and objectives. There is no justification for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7937  Respondent: 10799425 / Guildford Greenbelt Group (Susan Parker)  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport.

Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result. We object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt.

Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached. We object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk.

The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well WE are aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-
considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute health." The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to "Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and only make the situations worse. We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will network.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. We object due to the congestion that existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. We have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable. We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2).

There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. We have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network.

The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse. We object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute
in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health. We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/25  Respondent: 10799489 / Shai Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch in Burnt Common policy A43. This proposal was added at very late notice after previously being assured by the council leader there would be no significant new changes to the DLP in Send. The use of regulation 19 further adds to the betrayal. This enormous new proposal must require a full consultation under regulation 19. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses was rightly reduced to 185 in April 2016. This late and hasty attempt to push through this plan increases the number to 485! A totally excessive and unneeded number based on inflated projections of population growth by GBC. The proposed light industrial units can easily be accommodated at Slyfield and the proposed 4 way junction to the A3 will cause traffic gridlock, noise and air pollution for local residents. All this without yet mentioning this 100 acre site is GREEN BELT (a word no longer found in the GBCs dictionary). With prime agricultural land, rare enough in Surrey, and ancient 16th century protected woodland within the boundary, this land must be saved. There is a brook running through the middle of the site essential for drainage and the area is prone to flooding already. The site prevents urban sprawl between Ripley and Send vitally important. The villages medical center already extremely busy and local schools cannot cope with the 25% population growth this plan will bring to our village. We have received emails from relevant ministers and Sir Paul Beresford stating government policy is to protect the Green Belt and listen to local residents in these matters. Why does GBC neither protect or listen to those it is elected to represent. Conservative Councillors ran for election on a protecting the Green Belt, now elected they stab us in the back.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/943  Respondent: 10799489 / Shai Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy a43 garlick's arch;

once again, thousands of previous objections have been ignored and again there is no demand for so many houses or travelling show peoples plots at this location. This land is permanent green belt, and no exceptional circumstances exist
for development. It is prime agricultural land and contains ancient woodland that has existed since tudor times. Again, this area is prone to frequent flooding and contaminated by lead shots accumulated over 50 years. Living in Burntcommon Lane, we will be massively effected by this excessive development and planned new junction to the a3, massively increasing traffic in our area. Once again, this is green belt land that should not be built on, this will also join send and ripley into one continuous inhabited area, defeating the purpose of the green belt in seperating our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6406  Respondent: 10800065 / David Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1643  Respondent: 10800673 / Nigel Rowland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist

• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1

• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1271  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 - the building of houses on land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1274  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43, 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch being designated for new housing. The need has not been established.

I object to the proposed loss of the ancient woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1683  Respondent: 10803009 / M Robson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 proposed change at Garlick's Arch because:

• The amended plan ignores the thousands of previous objections from the local population.
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location in the amended plan
• This area is a beautiful Green Belt area with many old mature trees. No exceptional circumstances exist.
• An area where wildlife and plants can grow preserving our heritage.
• It is land between the A3 and the village and protects the local residents from increasing noise and pollution from the A3.
• Green Belt is part of our village setting, it is what makes our village a village. Send residents live in a village as this is the setting Send offers: living close to protected Green Belt and not in a town.
• 400 homes and 6 Travelling showpeople plots will impact the village character of Send. Woking and Guildford are nearby to offer town amenities if required. The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots are an excessive increase to Send / Ripley and this will result in overpopulation with more traffic impacting local roads and village.
• The area around London Road / Roundabout at Shell Garage / Portsmouth Road / A247, already has high levels of traffic in all directions, not just at peak times in the morning / evening but throughout the day / night.
• This area is particularly congested between 7:15 - 9:00 AM and 16:30 - 18:30 mainly by passing through traffic, impacting the local area. These roads serve as an alternative to the A3 leading to this congestion. Often the traffic is standing still during these hours.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact traffic on these roads. These roads / junctions are unable to cope with more traffic. This will require more funding to rectify and impact locals with ongoing road works.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact the local schools - the local Send school has just been extended and does not have sufficient capacity for more. This will require more local funding.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact healthcare. The Villages Medical Centre does not have sufficient capacity at present, let alone for a substantial increase in residents. This will require more local funding.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact ground pollution. Wildlife and flora are impacted. As the land is so near the A3 health for residents could be affected by asthma etc.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact the flooding situation in the area. The area is already suffering from flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch is and should be protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which justify its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states quite clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states its preference to use previously developed land, but GBC has removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

How can GBC justify not including this large brownfield site? This area is not suitable for large scale development due to poor transport provisions,

a lack of school places, medical facilities and utilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5799  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43) when there is an existing industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. This site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning. This again shows a lack of foresight and total disregard for the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6065  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt, and there does not appear to be any justified exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt.

Last minute The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a
Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency (see objection 4.). There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6083  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1928  Respondent: 10805537 / Robert Mote  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
• It will cause over-development of our village, with the proposed 400 additional homes being excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1 – when its gone its "gone" for good, and the Council has an obligation to preserve and protect for future generations
• It will join up Ripley and Send, thereby further eroding our separate identities, and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley. The traffic at peak times is already excessive, and is organically getting worse even before any development
• Other infrastructure will also be placed under excessive strain – from medical facilities to schools, as well as power, water and sewage – all of which have shown signs of strain in recent years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. It has ignored thousands of objections about Roads and Schools the school situation getting worse this summer many NOT GETTING ANY OF THE SIX SCHOOLS APPLIED FOR this year.

1. Since when has there been a demand for Travelling Showpeople the heavy traffic this will bring through our village small roads many places it is impossible for two large vehicles to pass.

1. This is a working greenbelt land there are a lot more brown land available also gives work to people if you get rid of all greenery between villages it will become a concrete jungle and grind to a halt on our roads.

1. We will be destroying our history as this ancient woodland that has been there since Elizabeth 1.

1. It has overhead cables which I believe is dangerous to build under plus it is prone to flooding.

6. The extra traffic will bring our small roads to a standstill as there is no room for widening and as pointed out already there are places two large vehicle can't pass

7. As for an on off access to the A3 it is on a bend and will cause many accidents that is the the reason Burnt Common Lane was blocked off many years ago

8. The A3 was built to bypass our villages and help to relieve us of this congestion this will be going backwards and build this excessive amount of houses we will come to a stand still .

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/518   Respondent: 10806465 / Moya Miller   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now on to A43 Garlicks Arch

I object to the proposal to build 400 homes & 6 Travellers plots.

For starters, I say Travellers and I MEAN travellers - [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. Dont try and dissuade me from this idea, I have lived in this area since 1965 and several times travellers have had to be evicted from the locality.[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

Now, 400 homes??? Where are all their vehicles going to be able to access the main roads, A3 and Portsmouth Road?

Where are they going to be able to sign on at a medical centre? This is stretched at present serving existing patients. Where are their children going to school? Send has a very nice new school, able to cope with children from the ages of 5 - 11 - EXISTING NUMBERS. Where do you propose the 400 new homes children learn?

All the above building is planned on the GREEN BELT which goes against all the previous promises to keep England Green.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
| Comment ID: PSLPS16/644  Respondent: 10807745 / Belinda Middleton  Agent: |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| 3) I object to the development at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) as the land is currently in the Green Belt. |
| 4) I object to the development of new houses at Garlick's Arch as there is no corresponding plan to improve the surrounding infrastructure, schools or medical facilities. The site is prone to flooding and is covered in ancient woodland and wildlife. This site was added at the last minute with no prior consultation and the additional housing is not needed. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: pslp172/2435  Respondent: 10807745 / Belinda Middleton  Agent: |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| 1) The amount of land to be taken out of the Green Belt seems well in excess of the space needed to build 400 homes. What will be the fate of the excess land? |
| 2) Garlick’s Arch (A43) is an unsustainable location. The nearest station is about 1.5 miles away and the bus services are infrequent. Residents will be dependent on cars. |
| 3) There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location. |
| 4) Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. The development will cause additional traffic on the A3 and the A247 and B2215 in Ripley, Send and West Clandon. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/5610  Respondent: 10809377 / Bernice Williams  Agent: |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| **POLICY A43 AND A43a - Garlick's Arch** |
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (88). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would have an enormous impact on local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

I trust that the objections made above are fully taken into consideration and that the 2016 draft Local Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psp172/4732  Respondent: 10811361 / Simon Crago  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
3. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt.
4. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
5. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
6. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
7. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
8. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
9. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure. Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.
10. Many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
11. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

12. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends: hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

13. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

14. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites. Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

15. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

16. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

17. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield, Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

18. I object on the grounds of poor air quality. The significant level of development being proposed will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

19. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley. Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

20. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2575  Respondent: 10812289 / Deborah Clover  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the changes in Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch because there is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots at this location. It is beautiful permanent Green Belt containing ancient woodland, some of which has been around since the time of Elizabeth 1st. It is also subject to frequent flooding & is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. There are NO exceptional circumstances to build on it & it's development would defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt & effectively join up Ripley & Send. Together with the 400 proposed new homes on this site, 6 plots for traveling showpeople & their associated large vehicles will generate excessive traffic & will cause total gridlock in our area. It also does not take in to account the inadequate infrastructure of roads, schools & medical facilities, as required by law!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6459  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3007  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3118  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3170  Respondent: 10813345 / Ruth Cope  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/603  Respondent: 10815553 / S.G.E. Smith  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object mainly about the building on the land known as A43 Garlicks Arch site area. This area is some fifteen to eighteen feet above Sendmarsh. At this moment the heavy rain is soaking into the fields. When its all concreted the water will obviously run down to Send Marsh and create a flooded area. Approximately 2 to 3 years ago. Over 1 million pounds was spent to avoid a flood, even with the fields taken so much of the water. What will happen when the fields become concrete? Surely we pay our rates and taxes to keep our lively hood safe.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/370  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 I object to the land at Garlick's Arch designated for 400 houses. This site was not in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon. The industrial development is not required and should be at Slyfield. The additional traffic resulting from such a development would increase the traffic on Send Road and Ripley which is already gridlocked at certain times of the day as is the A3. Thorough research and consultation would prove this site as impossible.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/926  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please find attached photos taken of the floods at Garlick's Arch in November 2012. This is a recognised flood plain which drains down into Send Marsh. Hence the name Marsh. I object to the planning proposals for housing and industrial sites because of the unsuitability of the land and also because of the traffic which would be generated on already congested roads. An added factor would be that future purchasers would not be able to get cover for flood risk.

[IMAGE 1]

[IMAGE 2]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  IMAGE 1.jpg (165 KB)  IMAGE 2.jpg (143 KB)

---

Comment ID: pslp172/239  Respondent: 10815681 / Penelope Corlett  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
**Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh**

I object to the inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots for which there is no demand. This is a beautiful site of ancient woodland and subject to flooding. Is Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances as to why this should be developed. All my previous objections regarding increased traffic still stand.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1637  **Respondent:** 10816481 / Jeff Waine  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch, Where there are the "exceptional circumstances""that you need to build on ancient woodland, the area is currently a flood zone, it lays in the green belt, you will be causing congestion for our roads even more.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1657  **Respondent:** 10816481 / Jeff Waine  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch, Where there are the "exceptional circumstances""that you need to build on ancient woodland, the area is currently a flood zone, it lays in the green belt, you will be causing congestion for our roads even more.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4692  **Respondent:** 10816513 / Annmarie Shenton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the Green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land. Why have GBC removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch?

Garlick’s Arch is not appropriate because:

- There is no transport infrastructure
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope with the increased needs these new homes
- The site is liable to flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/806</th>
<th>Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch. There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily house the 7,000 sq m proposed. Why was this site was removed from the Plan without any reason?

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors, hospitals etc. are already at capacity. It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment in the local surgeries without a long wait.

Are there plans to improve the capability of the emergency services, police, ambulance, fire brigade to cover the extra houses in the north east of the borough?

I wish my objections to be taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/131</th>
<th>Respondent: 10816705 / Maggie Cole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The development at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation.
2. The potential of an increase from a minimum 400 houses up to a possible 650 at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause
merger of these villages. Villages should remain individual and not be merged into one huge conurbation. Local facilities, doctors, schools etc. cannot cope with this increase. Have you tried getting an appointment with a GP recently.

3. Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.

4. Including six Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural area within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan. The allocation of six Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and therefore is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6015  Respondent: 10816993 / Jane Roberts  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3413  Respondent: 10817601 / Gerald Watson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write to object to plans in the above policy because again you have not listened to the hundreds of objections put to you last year, and you have increased the number of houses and included six sites for travelling showpeople. You have shown no evidence of the need for these sites on a beautiful Green Belt location and where you are required to show exceptional circumstances. This is gross over development of our village with an excessive number of homes for a village. There is beautiful ancient woodland at the site which has been there since the time of Elizabeth 1 and will join up Ripley and Send thereby defeating the purpose of the Green Belt. An additional 400 houses will cripple the roads around Ripley and Send and contaminate surrounding homes with noxious fumes from congested traffic. I am informed that there is lead shot accumulated over 50 years at the site which, as a parent, I would not want my children to live with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2706  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. mtrs. of industrial space at Garlick's Arch due to the destruction of ancient woodland and flood risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7563  Respondent: 10817633 / M Mansbridge  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. mtrs. of industrial space at Garlick's Arch due to the destruction of ancient woodland and flood risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/222  Respondent: 10818177 / Heather Coussens  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the 7000 sq m of warehousing being included in A43. Burnt Common already has warehouse facilities. I do not see the need for an industrial park with HGV’s rolling in and out.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/517  Respondent: 10818529 / John Hales  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Furthermore, I fundamentally object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1704  Respondent: 10818529 / John Hales  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO the development at GARLICK ARCH.

This proposed development of 400 houses and an industrial area of 7000 sq m is on land that contains ancient woodland which is protected by the Green Belt.

IF it is found that the industrial area is required then, it should be at SLYFIELD, and not in a residential area.

The 400 houses, together with the new 4 way interchange and proposed developments at WISLEY and BURPHAM will increase the traffic on the Portsmouth road and Burnt common roundabout, which are already extremely busy most of the day.

These proposed developments will also result in more traffic using Send as the route to Woking. The roads through Send and Old Woking are extremely narrow with many parked cars which large vehicles have trouble navigating on their way through.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wish to object most strongly to the proposed local plan proposals A42, A43, A43a A44 because:

Policy A43 30ha land at Garlicks Arch Burnt Common The proposal for an additional 400 homes outlined on the above policy is not required on top of the 13,860 homes already proposed for the borough. The above site is new and was not included on the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. The land in question is currently designated Green Belt and is permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents merging of settlements. The site has a particular conservation aspect as it is covered in ancient woodland dating from the 16th century and would be endangered by the scale of this development. The development of these sites will create a substantial increase in local traffic through Send and Ripley villages which are already very busy and congested at peak times.

The proposed industrial development of 7000sqm is not required as the latest employment Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. If there is a need why can’t this be provided on the Slyfield or other industrial estates in the borough?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4485  **Respondent:** 10819489 / Susan Cooper  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the Garlick’s Arch site.

This proposal has been included at a very late stage and has not been consulted upon previously. It was not included in the Regulation 18 draft.

There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant the development, but there are such circumstances which make it unacceptable, such as its conservation sensitivity, being covered with ancient woodland, with trees dating back to the 16th century.

According to the Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) required employment space has reduced by 80% since the previous draft plan, so is no need for the proposed 7000 sq m of industrial development on this site. If there is eventually such need, it should be situated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6199  **Respondent:** 10820417 / Trevor Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2131  **Respondent:** 10820417 / Trevor Smith  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 Change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all of the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location
- It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will most certainly cause the over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is an exquisite ancient woodland that has existed from the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt
- It is currently has a flood zone 2 allocation and is subject to frequent flooding
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6208  Respondent: 10820481 / Lisa Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlick's arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psp172/2134  Respondent: 10820481 / Lisa Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 Change at Garlick's Arch because:

• It ignores all of the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location
• It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will most certainly cause the over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is an exquisite ancient woodland that has existed from the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt
• It is currently has a flood zone 2 allocation and is subject to frequent flooding
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1088  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 Land at Garlic Arc~. This is a new site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances since it is covered by and ancient woodland. The proposed industrial site if singularly not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ENLA) shows a reduction of 80 per cent in requirement needs of employment floor space from the previous draft plan. A new four way interchange on to the A3 at Burnt common to serve this development would create gridlock. Have you ever tried crossing the road
especially in the rush hour nigh impossible. This is a ridiculous idea and really needs to be looked at very carefully. A full transparency should be made available and looked into very carefully, otherwise grid lock will be the result. These roads are not suitable for thousands of cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/475  Respondent: 10820961 / D Davies  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlicks Arch, Sendmarsh Policy A43. I object to this policy because

- It ignores thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permeant Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist
- It will cause over development of our villages and the number of homes in excessive
- It will join up Ripley, Send and Clandon and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. A lot of this area is in a flood zone
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years.
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up local roads of Ripley, Send and Clandon causing gridlock which has happened before.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1787  Respondent: 10821665 / Chris Sansom  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43-GARLICK’S ARCH, SEND MARSH

This proposed development of 400 houses and 6/8 Travellers’ Sites will cause the following problems:-

This is a designated Green Belt area and there have been many previous objections to any plans to build on this plot. It acts as a buffer both of noise and exhaust pollution between the A3 and the old A3 (Portsmouth Road between Send and Ripley).

This proposed development will cause the following problems:-

An approximation of at least an additional 600 cars-further pollution etc.

Where will the access to the development be?

The existing public transport system could not cope at peak times with a large increase in users.
Send Primary School has no further capacity for more pupils, and local secondary schools are in a similar position.

The Villages Medical Centre has no further capacity for more patients.

The current utilities infrastructure already struggles to meet the existing demands of the village (ie low water pressure, power ‘outs’) to upgrade the utilities to meet the increased demand will not only cause disruption to the existing customers, it will also further delay traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6641  **Respondent:** 10822913 / Karen Dougherty  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

In addition, a recent Outline Planning Application (16/P/00783) for a smaller development on this site was refused by GBC for many of the above reasons, not least that the Green Belt should be protected. The report states that “there are no overriding reasons that would constitute very special circumstances to justify the harm that it would cause to the Green Belt”. How then can this much larger proposed development on the same site now be seriously considered as suitable?

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

I object because the stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

I object because this site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

I object because the site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). It has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Special Protection Area and will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1094   Respondent: 10824065 / B. Self   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I believe that the evidence for the inclusion of policy A43 (Land at Garlick's Arch) for 400 houses is, at best contentious and, at worst brutal in its application. I strongly oppose and object to its inclusion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1138   Respondent: 10824065 / B. Self   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Having lived at this address for 24 years, I feel that in respect of Send and Ripley the change to the plan is disproportionate and out-of-keeping with the historical nature of this area.

2. I object. in the strongest possible terms, to the inclusion of 6 travelling showpeople plots. The clauses relating to the possibility to these plots subsequently being used for other development in the event of insufficient interest is indicative of the lack of evidence.

3. There is no evidence of a need for 6 Travelling showpeople lots. The clauses relating to the possibility of these plots subsequently being used for other development in the event of insufficient interest is indicative of the lack of evidence.

4. The inclusion of 6 Travelling showpeople plots is contentious and brutal in its application as it would result in the area being overdeveloped.

5. There is no evidence that 6 travelling showpeople plots would enhance the life of the local community and, furthermore, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

6. This revision would impact adversely on my current quality of life.

I am, therefore, wholeheartedly against the change to Policy A43, and urge it to be rescinded please.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1545</th>
<th>Respondent: 10824385 / Ian Macfarlane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2016</th>
<th>Respondent: 10824961 / Debby Fieldus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh. This land floods and is ancient woodland it provides a very necessary pollution and noise barrier between the A3 and the residents of Send. The Industrial Space if indeed needed, should be located at Slyfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2993</th>
<th>Respondent: 10826145 / Terry Fieldus</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
<td>Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch – this land is part of an ancient woodland with trees which have existed since the 16th century. This land is also prone to flooding and is a necessary buffer between the A3 and the residents of Send.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5986  Respondent: 10826209 / David Rider  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object in particular to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. The proposed 400 houses and commercial units would completely swamp existing local roads, schools & medical facilities. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common that I also strongly object to. Current traffic levels are already too high around Burnt Common. Expanding the A3 junction would cause gridlock all day along A247 and Portsmouth Road. I also object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal on the grounds that it was not included in the previous consultation in 2014, and was added to the current proposed plan at very late notice, preventing proper due diligence from all interested parties. I also object to the proposed commercial development, as I believe it would make far more sense to expand the current commercial Slyfield area where I understand land is available

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2808  Respondent: 10826209 / David Rider  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the revised proposal for this plot as it will significantly eradicate the green belt area that delineates Ripley and Send, and create very significant increase in traffic from 400 homes that will totally swamp the existing modest local roads, especially Portsmouth Road and the A247. These roads are already under significant pressure from current population demands with frequent traffic jams delaying journeys to school and work. In addition, local infrastructure, especially schools and medical facilities will be swamped by the significant extra demand, requiring people to traffic further to reach such facilities in other areas, further exacerbating the traffic issues. I recognise the need for some new housing in the area, but 400 homes is totally disproportionate for this relatively small area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/127  Respondent: 10826497 / Barry Vince  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 Garlicks Arch

The potential increase from 400 dwellings at this site is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages and will cause coalescence of these lovely villages and will have a huge impact on our already congested roads.

The inclusion of 6x Travellers plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and is not identified as a need within the Local Plan and is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I am writing to let you know that I object to your plans to build on our green belt by putting over 400 houses and warehouses at Garlick Arch, Burnt Common, I moved to the village and paid a premium to do so, so I could bring my children up in a lovely village life and not bought up in a built up area, if I wanted to live in a built up area I would have moved to one! so having the green belt areas THAT SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON, ensuring an nicer way of life. As it is living in the village has many more problems without adding more, the amount of traffic constantly cutting through, to reach the A3 makes going to work and driving to school a head ache, by you consenting more houses to be built, would be pure madness, the roads are just not built for the volume of traffic now let alone adding congestion to it, even by adding an extra road, I really can't see that, that will help. I'm sure you are aware, there are not enough schools in the area, it took me a long stressful time to secure school placements for my children, and getting into my local and nearest school was hell! By building 400 homes, you are looking at around 800 people plus moving in, where on earth do you think these children will go to school? As far as the GP surgery goes that is also at its limit, and getting an appointment to see your doctor is a joke, as there are not enough appointments to give out to the volume of people we have registered there now let alone adding another 800 plus people.

By sneaking these plans in at last minute is so out of order, this area SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED FROM THE GREEN BELT, and at the rate you are going both SEND & RIPLEY will no longer be villages, they will turn into a mass of houses and into a town, and that nobody wants to see happen, your plans for all these extra houses is NOT wanted or NEEDED.

These plans are new and they were not included in plans before, they are not needed on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlick's Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and therefore is not compliant with the minimum of 500 as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3153  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. Ripley village has already recently provided a number of new dwellings and re-development. Further proposed local development and loss of green belt will adversely affect the character and increase traffic to an already busy location (especially when traffic incidences occur on the A3 and M25)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3155  Respondent: 10828737 / Claire Dawson  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were:
a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]"
b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available and therefore there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42).

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5: "We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan".

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this statement in respect of both A43 Garlick's Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and therefore should not go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5928  **Respondent:** 10828801 / Kathryn Fox  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed in this area; there is already an industrial area at Slyfield. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated. With proper use of brownfields sites this Green Belt site is not required.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3071  **Respondent:** 10828961 / Carey Lodge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the fact that this news it eat Garlick's Arch was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and so has not been consulted on previously. This is, surely, wrong.

I object to the proposed development of land at Garlick's Arch for housing and industrial use. We actually need 800 new homes in Guildford although GBC have suggested 13,860.

There is no need whatsoever to develop Green Belt land, which includes significantly important woodland, to build yet another 400 homes.

I object to the proposal for 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. It is simply not needed, as the ELNA 2015 shows an 80% reduction in employment floor space since the previous assessment. If there is a need in
Guildford there are previously approved plans for industrial use at Slyfieid where existing infrastructure can support development. If the Garlick's Arch development went ahead this would include a new 4-way junction with the A3 at Burnt Common that Send simply couldn't cope with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3077  Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to plans for a 4-way interchange at Burnt Common for several reasons. There is no need to build over Green Belt land to provide this interchange. If this junction was developed it would result in a huge increase in traffic through Send on the A247. The road is already struggling with traffic at peak times and this is only going to get worse when the new schools open in Send Barns lane. Increased traffic through the village will probably result in calls by groups to restrict parking to allow traffic flow, further implying on residents of Send and detrimental to local businesses. If the 2,000 houses proposed for both Wisley and Burpham go ahead it will only increase traffic further. I object to this proposal as Government guidance to planners was that Green Belt should only be built on if there are exceptional circumstances requiring this to happen. There are no exceptional circumstances at Garlick's Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2407  Respondent: 10828961 / Carey Lodge  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and Guildford has more than enough traveller plots.

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist to allow development on it. Almost every week in the media Government Ministers state that the Green Belt must be protected and only developed where overarching need is proved and yet Guildford Borough Council seem determined to destroy this area of ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1.

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt. It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation. It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years. It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object in particular to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. The proposed 400 houses and commercial units would completely swamp existing local roads, schools & medical facilities. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common that I also strongly object to. Current traffic levels are already too high around Burnt Common. Expanding the A3 junction would cause gridlock all day along A247 and Portsmouth Road. I also object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal on the grounds that it was not included in the previous consultation in 2014, and was added to the current proposed plan at very late notice, preventing proper due diligence from all interested parties. I also object to the proposed commercial development, as I believe it would make far more sense to expand the current commercial Slyfield area where I understand land is available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the revised proposal for this plot as it will significantly eradicate the green belt area that delineates Ripley and Send, and create very significant increase in traffic from 400 homes that will totally swamp the existing modest local roads, especially Portsmouth Road and the A247. These roads are already under significant pressure from current population demands with frequent traffic jams delaying journeys to school and work. In addition, local infrastructure, especially schools and medical facilities will be swamped by the significant extra demand, requiring people to traffic further to reach such facilities in other areas, further exacerbating the traffic issues. I recognise the need for some new housing in the area, but 400 homes is totally disproportionate for this relatively small area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arche - 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots

The plan has ignored thousands of objections from the local people of Send

There is no proof of the need for Travelling Show people plots in this location

The Village of Send is on Green Belt Land and therefore should only be built on in exceptional circumstances
The increase in houses will cause over-development of our villages
The number of homes is excessive and is not necessary
It is an ancient woodland and should be preserved
It goes against the Green Belt Policy to prevent urban sprawl
The site is currently a flood zone 2 allocation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:
I object to building 400 houses and 7,000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch - I bought a house in Send Marsh 25 years ago to enjoy the peace and tranquility of the villages in Send and Ripley and to bring my family up in a safe, healthy environment. The industrial area is at Slyfield where future industrial development should be. A small housing estate was built on the back of the Send Marsh estate where I live this has impacted severely on the traffic flow on and off the estate; ill thought road layouts and noise pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1442</th>
<th>Respondent: 10829409 / Anne Fulton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2611</th>
<th>Respondent: 10830209 / Susan Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I must object most strongly to the various policies proposed in the latest process of the new Draft Local Plan, covering:- Policy A42 Clock barn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Garlic's Arch Send Marsh Policy A43, Land at Burnt Common, Policy A58.

Although different developments, all variations to the Policies seem to be proposed without any regard to existing residents.

It seems that no consideration has been given to the effect they will affect the general infrastructure of the village, at peak times now, the roads are very busy, if these proposals are allowed to go ahead there will be gridlock night and morning. Problems occur with flooding now, again this will only worsen, there is also the consideration that some of the proposals are not required, the travelling Showpeople plots at Garlic's Arch as one and industrial or warehousing at Burnt Common.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2353</th>
<th>Respondent: 10830689 / Brian Robinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. The many previous objections seem to have been ignored, The permanent Green Belt is to be ruined where no exceptional circumstance exists Send will be joined to Ripley with the many other unnecessary and unwanted proposals, including the plots for Showpeople.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1892  Respondent: 10830753 / AJ Cheeseman  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

6 Travelling Showpeople plots is way out of proportion for the village and there will be an increase in juggernauts and lorries through the village as a result;

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people;

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist;

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive;

It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth !;

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt;

It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation;

It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years;

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley;

It will create an increase in pollution which will be detrimental to the health of the villagers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2753  Respondent: 10830785 / PE Whatley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal A43 which would permit build houses on Green Belt land, which includes the land at Garlick's Arch. Local residents have made their feelings very clear in the past and will never willingly accept the erosion of our Green Belt just to appease developers who could use brownfield sites if they were prepared to put in the extra money required. Local services are already stretched and the added traffic will reduce everyone's quality of life.
There are no alternative routes other than back roads when traffic comes to a standstill at the moment; those 'backroads' will be unpleasant and dangerous places to live, walk or drive. Add in the vehicles of over 500 houses in Send, 1500 at Wisley and 1500 at Gosden Hill, and the area will grind to a traffic-polluted halt.

I object to the proposal A43 and A44 to include traveller pitches anywhere in the immediate area because there is absolutely no proven need for these. However, to disproportionately allot such sites in Guildford Borough as whole on the area around Send is not acceptable as there should be a more even distribution over the entire Borough. How come Wisley and Gosden Hill are only allocated 8 each for their proposed developments of over 1500 homes, whilst Send gets 10?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/6483</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10831681 / James Cope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3163</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10831681 / James Cope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no &quot;exceptional circumstances&quot; exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/3099</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10832129 / Christopher Lawrence</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
Once again it ignores the thousands of objections already made by local people.
There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.
It is permanent beautiful Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist.
It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It is an exceptional ancient woodland dating back to the reign of Elisabeth I.
It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.
It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years.
It will cause traffic chaos and choke the village roads which are already blocked during rush hours

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7331  Respondent: 10833025 / M Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

I object to policy A43 Garlicks Arch.

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

This proposal was never in the regulation 18 draft, and as such has never been consulted on, and was slipped into the Local Plan at the last minute.

This site is green belt comprising of woodland and meadows between the A3 and Send and Ripley. This site has a particular sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland, some trees date back to the 16th century.

It is permanently protected by the NPFF which prevents the merging of settlements, there are no exceptional
circumstances to develop this land.

To destroy a natural boundary between the A3 and the villages would be incredibly damaging to them. The obvious increase in pollution caused by massive amounts of extra traffic would be hazardous to health of residents young and old of both Ripley and Send. The existing boundary also absorbs some noise and pollution from the A3 itself.

The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not needed since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floorspace from the previous draft plan. Additionally GBC have not provided any evidence of a requirement for this. Basically this means that industrial space at Burntcommon is not required. Even if there was a requirement for 7000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is already available space.

Furthermore, a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burntcommon to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road A247 would become gridlocked all day, as it would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley and the 2000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take that amount of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

This proposal was never in the regulation 18 draft, and as such has never been consulted on, and was slipped into the Local Plan at the last minute.
This site is green belt comprising of woodland and meadows between the A3 and Send and Ripley. This site has a particular sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland, some trees date back to the 16th century.

It is permanently protected by the NPFF which prevents the merging of settlements, there are no exceptional circumstances to develop this land.

To destroy a natural boundary between the A3 and the villages would be incredibly damaging to them. The obvious increase in pollution caused by massive amounts of extra traffic would be hazardous to health of residents young and old of both Ripley and Send. The existing boundary also absorbs some noise and pollution from the A3 itself.

The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not needed since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floorspace from the previous draft plan. Additionally GBC have not provided any evidence of a requirement for this. Basically this means that industrial space at Burntcommon is not required. Even if there was a requirement for 7000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is already available space.

Furthermore, a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burntcommon to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road A247 would become gridlocked all day, as it would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley and the 2000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take that amount of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1803</th>
<th>Respondent: 10833537 / AC Vause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OBJECT** to the location for new employment floorspace at Garlick's Arch -Site A43 (Policy E2)

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class B1c, B2 and B8) floorspace will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Garlick’s Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1811</th>
<th>Respondent: 10833537 / AC Vause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BS).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. The A3 is already at a very high capacity; the additional traffic from the houses and an industrial site would lead to severe congestion, nearing (or even reaching) gridlock. I also object to the industrial space on the grounds that the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan of 80%, so it is simply not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been there for decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7495  
Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance and, therefore, there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The Plan states that Brownfield Site should be used in preference and yet Guildford Borough Council have removed the Burnt Common proposal and replaced it with Green Belt land at Garlick’s Arch. There are other reasons that this site is unsuitable which have already been mentioned such as frequent flooding, lack of transport infrastructure, the site of ancient woodland with accompanying wildlife habitat and the lack of schools and medical facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/998  
Respondent: 10836033 / Katherine Gervasio  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017)

I am objecting to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017) and the changes around Ripley and Send, which have increased development so that this Plan is even worse than the 2016 proposals.

I object to the increased A43 Garlicks Arch development. It is Green Belt land and has no identified or exceptional need with the Local Plan Documentation.

I object to the proposed 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. There is no need for this many and the designated formula is for 1500-1999 home on the same site. There are 400 houses proposed on the site so 6 is too many for the amount of houses.

I object to this many Traveller plots in the Ripley/Send per se. In Section 4.2.22 of the Plan it states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.

I object to the change in wording and likely consequences on ‘Affordable Homes’. In the 2016 version of the Plan (Policy 4.2.23) it stated that Developers will be expected to provide land for affordable homes at nil value. Now it just says “Off-site provision or payment in lieu is expected to enable the same amount of additional affordable housing as would have been delivered on site.” Developers can just pay money to the Council to avoid including affordable homes. This is disgraceful!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2225  
Respondent: 10836097 / B.V. Dabbs  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GARLICKS ARCH NOT INCLUDED IN REG.18 DRAFT, PERMANENTLY PROTECTED AS GREEN BELT BY NPPF PUBLIC CONSERVATION OF ANCIENT C16 WOODLAND. WOULD SUGGEST IF 7000sqm INDUSTRIAL SPACE IS NEEDED BUILD IT ON THE BROWNFIELD SITE AT SLYFIELD

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3378  Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site proposed under Policy A43 which is one of the last minute additions to the GBC Plan. Development of Garlick’s Arch will destroy ancient woodland and Green Belt land. The requirement for a further 400 homes must be justified along with the need for 7000sq m of industrial space when the Slyfield site would seem to have the necessary acreage available for this purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/884  Respondent: 10837313 / Mary Jane Gray  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes under Policy A43 of the Plan for 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots at Garlick’s Arch. Once again this proposal ignores all previous concerns with respect to the development of this site in respect of loss of Green Belt, traffic congestion, drainage, lead pollution and the destruction of ancient woodland. It would also seem to be totally as much as anything else to locate Travelling Showpeople on a residential development such as that being proposed. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4119  Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I strongly object to Policy A43, Garlicks Arch, with its proposed A3 junction, 400 houses and a large area of industrial and warehousing 7000sq metres. This would significantly impact all aspects of Send’s life – the A247 is gridlocked at both ends of the working day and whenever the A3 has an accident- the local schools and medical centre would be overlooked, this site is new and is on Green Belt protection through NPPF, lastly it was not included in the regulation 18 draft.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4122  Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Finally I enclose a cutting from the before mentioned “About Guildford” publication, in particular the paragraphs leaded “your questions about the local plan answered”

“questions. Will there be developments along the A3 from J10 of M25 to beyond the Hogs back?

Answer NO

It then proceeds to explain that in fact there will be some developments.

The paragraph alongside it to the right states “the plan rejects any schemes that would have a detrimental effect on the green belt.

I submit that policy A43. Garlicks Arch proposal cannot be considered to be anything other than detrimental to the green belt.

Such comments in print from “Guildford Borough Council” are in my opinion designed to confuse folks who are very worried over the prospects of the potential disruption of the status quo and all we hold dear.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2376  Respondent: 10837665 / J.H. Lakeman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A43 at Garlicks arch because I feel that NO "EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES" exist to warrant the destruction of this ancient woodland and the resultant loss of permanent Green Belt, also there us no proven demand for plots for travelling showpeople to be located here abouts, furthermore the excessive number of homes will virtually join ripley and send and have a detrimental impact on local roads and byways and ignores the flood zone 2 allocations and the fact that the land is contaminated by over 50 years of lead shot accumulation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/119  Respondent: 10839009 / Jacky Fenton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly OBJECT to Garlick’s Arch as this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2497  Respondent: 10839073 / Annie Hutchison  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed new development at Garlick's Arch. GBC has failed to demonstrate the need for a further 400 houses in addition to those already included in the Plan, or the need for such an extensive industrial/warehouse development. The area, which is currently Green Belt, includes ancient woodland, which, once lost, could never be replaced. The area already has an established industrial site at Slyfield. Given the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 showed an expected 80% reduction in the required employment floor space from the previous draft plan, this could easily be accommodated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/801  Respondent: 10839233 / Sheila Harris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes for the allocation of 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots at Garlick's Arch under Policy A43 of the Plan. The proposal ignores all previous concerns that the development of Garlick's Arch will destroy ancient woodland and Green Belt land together with the very real possibility of causing drainage problems for the areas of Send Marsh that are downstream of the site. The number of houses proposed at this site is excessive and will undoubtedly adversely affect the local traffic situation in Send and Ripley and will be the start of a 'bridge' of development which will join the two villages thereby defeating the purpose of the Green Belt provision. I would also question whether there is a proven need for Travelling Showpeople Plots at this location especially as it would seem wholly inappropriate to locate what are effectively commercial sites within a residential area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/613  Respondent: 10839393 / F.A. Howell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43- Land at Garlick's Arch, Send marsh

I OBJECT TO POLICY A43 CHANGE AT GARLICK'S ARCH because

1) it will generate much more traffic than we already have to put up with
2) it will join the villages of Send and Ripley (Ripley already overloaded with traffic from Junction 10 on the M25 and a 'short-cut' for traffic from the A3 which ends up in Send!)
3) the thousands of objections that have been made by local people previously have been totally ignored
4) the site frequently floods
5) OUR GREEN BELT AND THE ANCIENT WOODLANDS (DATING BACK TO THE TIME OF ELIZABETH 1) SHOULD BE LEFT AS THEY ARE!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3400   Respondent: 10839649 / Lawrence Harris   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site proposed under Policy A43 'which is one of the last minute additions to the GBC Plan. Development of Garlick's Arch will destroy ancient woodland and Green Belt land as well as create severe drainage problems for the areas of Send Marsh that are downstream of the site. Any development of this area will need to be proven by a full and thorough Environmental Study to indicate how these problems are to be addressed. I would also question the need for a further 400 homes over and above the previous figures as well as the need for 7000sqm of industrial space when the Slyfield site would seem to have the necessary acreage available for this purpose.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/800   Respondent: 10839649 / Lawrence Harris   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed changes for the allocation of 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots at Garlick's Arch under Policy A43 of the Plan. The proposal ignores all previous concerns that the development of Garlick's Arch will destroy ancient woodland and Green Belt land together with the very real possibility of causing drainage problems for the areas of Send Marsh that are downstream of the site. The number of houses proposed at this site is excessive and will undoubtedly adversely affect the local traffic situation in Send and Ripley and will be the start of a 'bridge' of development which will join the two villages thereby defeating the purpose of the Green Belt provision. I would also question whether there is a proven need for Travelling Showpeople Plots at this location especially as it would seem wholly inappropriate to locate what are effectively commercial sites within a residential area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/2781</td>
<td>10839937 / Mark Pycraft</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch, which is being proposed as the site for 400 houses and also 7000 square metres of industrial space. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) has concluded that there has been a dramatic reduction in the employment floor space needed, down 80% from the previous ELNA of 2013. This means that there is no longer the need for this industrial space. Also regarding the industrial space, together with the proposed 400 houses at this site; the pressure on an already heavily used A3 would be too great, leading to severe delays, increased accident risk and potential gridlock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pslp172/1548</td>
<td>10840321 / J.A. Manlow</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]; also again traffic problems; not to mention the 400 proposed new homes – again even more overcrowding in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/5353</td>
<td>10840513 / Lee Webb</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/39</td>
<td>10840641 / John Pyne</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object also to Policy A 43 designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sqm for industrial use at Burnt Common, our local roads cannot cope with any further rise in traffic levels, Potters Lane in particular already becomes congested and dangerous with narrowing sections and tight bends, especially at peak times during the day. Potters lane has become a ‘rat run’ at rush hour especially in the morning and I have witnessed to many accidents and near misses in the 20 years I lived in Potters Lane. A life will be lost if the weight of traffic increases beyond the level it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2685  **Respondent:** 10843585 / Jackie Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the idea of building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch in Send. This site is covered by ancient woodland and the site also floods. GBC have failed to disclose their housing calculations which is out of order.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7550  **Respondent:** 10843585 / Jackie Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the idea of building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch in Send. This site is covered by ancient woodland and the site also floods. GBC have failed to disclose their housing calculations which is out of order.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/294  Respondent: 10843585 / Jackie Payne  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A43 regarding development at Garlick's Arch as this means destroying a beautiful ancient woodland and huge canopy of trees and will cause massive over development of our village with the number of homes being proposed as excessive. Development of Garlick's Arch will generate a huge amount of additional traffic and cause massive congestion in the local roads in Send and Ripley. There is no proven demand for travelling showpeople plots in this location. Pollution levels will rise and these are already a concern in this area. This proposed development is already subject to frequent flooding. It will effectively join Send and Ripley together and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/173  Respondent: 10843873 / Allyson Mulvihill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the above plan. We do not need 400 more houses. The ground you have selected was not on the original plan and is green belt.

This would be disastrous for send and the burnt common area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4871  Respondent: 10844609 / Sam Critchlow  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause
coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/171</th>
<th>Respondent: 10844673 / James Purkiss</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to policy A43 because there is no need for traveller sites in the green belt.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

#Also 400 homes is an unreasonable burden for us to assume. Not to mention the fact it is a flood area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3809</th>
<th>Respondent: 10844929 / Maureen Wright</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlicks Arch due to the following points.

There is no proven demand for plots to accommodate Travelling Showpeople.

National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt land. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. It constitutes over development. These further changes to the plan are not required.

It is an unsustainable location. It will undoubtedly cause traffic chaos on the minor surrounding roads. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion, anyone who lives in these areas will confirm that this is the case. Substantially more vehicle movements will result in even more congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

This area contains ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century, which should be preserved. There is no good reason to tamper with it.

This site is identified as being in a Flood Zone 2 and regularly floods during winter months.

This site contains land which is heavily contaminated by many years of shooting with lead shot.
Above all, the latest changes to this site have completely ignored the thousands of previous comments from residents (who know the area best of all) during the 2016 Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7664  Respondent: 10844993 / Simon Wright  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlicks Arch.

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for
only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

This proposal was never in the regulation 18 draft, and as such has never been consulted on, and was slipped into the Local Plan at the last minute.

This site is green belt comprising of woodland and meadows between the A3 and Send and Ripley. This site has a particular sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland, some trees date back to the 16th century.

It is permanently protected by the NPFF which prevents the merging of settlements, there are no exceptional circumstances to develop this land.

To destroy a natural boundary between the A3 and the villages would be incredibly damaging to them. The obvious increase in pollution caused by massive amounts of extra traffic would be hazardous to health of residents young and old of both Ripley and Send. The existing boundary also absorbs some noise and pollution from the A3 itself.

The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not needed since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floorspace from the previous draft plan. Additionally GBC have not provided any evidence of a requirement for this. Basically this means that industrial space at Burntcommon is not required. Even if there was a requirement for 7000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield
where there is already available space.

Furthermore, a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burntcommon to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road A247 would become gridlocked all day, as it would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley and the 2000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take that amount of traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7289  **Respondent:** 10845537 / Chloe Moore  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

and development at garlic arch

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5400  **Respondent:** 10845569 / Stu Edwards  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development at garlic arch

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/93  **Respondent:** 10846145 / Phillipa Bottomley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I was very surprised to see the new development plan.

Having read the previous plan and having attended the meeting in April at Lancaster village hall, nothing had previously been mentioned about the two areas below:

**Policy A 43 30 ha land at Garlick's Arch Burnt Common.**

Whilst in principle it seems like a good idea to have both on and off access to the A3 at the Burnt Common roundabout, I am concerned about the effect it will have on the already congested local roads. We have massive lorries coming through
Clandon (another problem) and now there would be even more, using this interchange from the M25/A3 to get to Woking. The road passing through Send is very congested for long periods during the day and this would only exacerbate the problem.

If we build houses but no offices, where do the people go to work? They all have to get in their cars to drive to work. Industrial units mean more big lorries on the narrow and already congested roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6928  Respondent: 10846145 / Phillipa Bottomley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Whoever it may concern.

I am very concerned about the plans for Garlick's Arch and the associated increase in traffic on the roads.

Many of the surrounding roads are very narrow and we have had wing mirrors gone and sides of cars badly scratched.

Although the new entrance and exit onto the A3 sounds good I am concerned at the increase in lorries and cars this would generate going through the already very congested Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2569  Respondent: 10846145 / Phillipa Bottomley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because the scale of the development is inappropriate for local roads, schools and surgeries. This will have a significant impact on traffic through Send, Ripley and Clandon, and will have a material impact on local schools, access to medical services and the Woking trains. This development will connect Ripley to Send developing a single conurbation contrary to the aims of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/383  Respondent: 10846241 / John Ford  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick Arch because again it has ignored the thousands of previous objections by local people. This proposal will also erode the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances can be justified i.e. plots for travellers. The number of homes proposed is excessive and will cause an over-development of our village. It will cause increased flooding possibilities in a flood zone 2 area and cause further traffic congestion on the roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1.1 I object to policy A43 “Garlick’s Arch” on the grounds that;

1.2 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided

1.3 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result

1.4 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

1.5 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

1.6 I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq.m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.

1.7 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
1.8 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

1.9 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

1.10 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1.11 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

1.12 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

1.13 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1.14 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

1.15 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

1.16 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

1.17 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

1.18 Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

1.19 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
1.20 I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

1.21 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

1.22 It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4037  Respondent: 10847521 / Andrew Procter  Agent: 10847521 / Andrew Procter

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1.1 I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

1.2 It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

1.3 There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

1.4 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.5 The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

1.6 This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

1.7 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

1.8 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
1.9 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

1.10 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

1.11 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

1.12 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

1.13 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

1.14 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

1.15 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1.16 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

1.17 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

1.18 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1.19 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
1.20 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

1.21 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

1.22 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

1.23 **I object** due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

1.24 **I object** to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

1.25 **I object** to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

1.26 It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Greenbelt was created to protect rural communities and to stop urban sprawl. The villages in Guildford Borough need this protection and therefore any plans to erode the Green Belt must be abandoned.

The proposals outlined in the Local Plan do not state how the Borough intends to address the education, health, pollution, and public transport problems that the increase in the population in the area will cause.

To sum it up we feel the number of houses proposed throughout the entire borough is far too large. The erosion of the Green Belt should must not be allowed. The increase of vehicles on the roads will increase the pollution in the area adding to health problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/871  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley

Garlick’s Arch is within the Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal. Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land. Why have GBC removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch?

Garlick’s Arch is not appropriate because:

- There is no transport infrastructure.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope with the increased needs these new homes
- The site is liable to flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/872  Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch. There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily house the 7,000 sq m proposed. Why was this site was removed from the Plan without any reason?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/150</th>
<th>Respondent: 10848513 / Martin Cole</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please find below my objections to the Revised Local Plan:

- The development at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation.
- The potential of an increase from a minimum 400 houses up to a possible 650 at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause merger of these villages. Villages should remain individual and not be merged into one huge conurbation. Local facilities, doctors, schools etc. cannot cope with this increase. Have you tried getting an appointment with a GP recently.
- Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.
- Including six Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural area within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan. The allocation of six Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and therefore is out of scale with the proposed development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6440</th>
<th>Respondent: 10848577 / Jen Dunbar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site is covered in ancient woodland which is home to many animals and birds which would be impacted by the destruction of the woodland. The industrial space could be accommodate instead at Slyfield which would avoid the destruction of ancient woodland. Guildford's housing needs could be met by the proper use of brownfield sites, thereby preserving the Green Belt and upholding election promises.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/197</th>
<th>Respondent: 10849377 / Vickie Leonard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6314  Respondent: 10849697 / Audrey Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch opposite Send Marsh Rd. This site floods and is an ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if were, it should be at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3610  Respondent: 10849761 / Tony Beresford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because, it will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/376  Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 Garlicks Arch, Send

I strongly object to 400 new homes and an industrial site. The additional strain on our resources in the village ie. schools and doctors surgery will be horrendous. The extra traffic through our beautiful village including HGV's is not acceptable. We in the village do not want a new 4 way junction for the A3. This site should remain as greenbelt with its beauty and wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/508  Respondent: 10851745 / Natalie Green  Agent:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople in this location

It is green belt land and no exceptional circumstances exist

The number of homes is excessive and not needed in our village

It will generate excessive traffic and block up already busy roads in Send

The land is subject to flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3557  Respondent: 10852289 / Barry Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to plan A43 which includes the 30 hectares of Garlick's Arch in this Plan A43. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft, and has not been consulted on previously. It forms part of the Green Belt and is permanently protected by the NPPF, which is there to prevent the merging of settlements. It also contains around 5 hectares of ancient woodland, some of which dates back to the 16th century the plan includes the building of 400 houses and nearly 2 acres of industrial buildings and warehousing. The ENLA of 2015 shows an 80% reduction in employment space over that of 2013, therefore industrial space at Burntcommon is no longer required. Quite apart from losing Green Belt land, the extra traffic generated by an estate of this size, which will consist of about 800 cars and many HGV’s, will put an unbearable pressure on all the roads around the Burntcommon roundabout (A247/B2215), especially at rush hour times. As well as the roads being unable to cope with such huge population growth, neither will the local schools or the Villages Medical Centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3133  Respondent: 10852289 / Barry Scott  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist
• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1835  Respondent: 10852801 / Carolyn Hart  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This area is covered by ancient woodland and the area is prone to flooding. If industrial space is needed why can this not be accommodated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/522  Respondent: 10853249 / Evan Parry-Morris  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
a) It ignores many thousand previous objections from local people.
b) There are no proven reasons why there should be Travelling Show People plots at the location.
c) There are no ‘exceptional Circumstances’ why the Green Belt should be permanently damaged.
d) The number of new homes would be excessive, and our village would be over-developed.
e) Send and Ripley would be joined, and Green Belt would be sacrificed.
f) The area is subject to flooding.
g) Increased traffic will cause gridlock on local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/90  Respondent: 10853857 / Norman Kidd  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **POLICY A 43.30 ha LAND AT GARLICK’S ARCH, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.** There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is **NEW** and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has **NOT** been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80 in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it. In fact, leaving Send Close to join the A247 always takes several minutes due to the traffic loads, during peak times takes a lot longer. The proposals now being brought forward will increase the traffic loads to a huge degree to an unacceptable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3982  **Respondent:** 10853857 / Norman Kidd  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

POLICY A43 30ha LAND AT GARLICK’S ARCH, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is **NEW** and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has **NOT** been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80 in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it. In fact, leaving Send Close to join the A247 always takes several minutes due to the traffic loads, during peak times takes a lot longer. The proposals now being brought forward will increase the traffic loads to a huge degree to an unacceptable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3265  **Respondent:** 10854113 / Sarah Pickering  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

WE OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be aribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a Brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

WE OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2841  Respondent: 10854241 / Sian Holwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people and increases the housing to 400 with 6 travelling showpeople plots. Why?
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Garlick’s Arch development, this area floods, will new house owner’s be able to get House Insurance? In fact will they even be informed that the land is likely to flood, or has been flooded in the past?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1110  Respondent: 10855553 / Emma Tallick  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3550  Respondent: 10855713 / Janet Holland  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to policy A43.30ha Land at Garrick's Arch. There is no need for more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough. It is Green Belt protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. It is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back to the 16th century and once lost, is lost forever. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80Yo in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Therefore the proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is not needed. The obvious place for any new industrial development is at Slyfield, Guildford - an industrial site already set up and running. There would then be no need to have to build a new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this industrial development. Surely saving money!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the 2016 draft local plan for reasons as follows

1. The underhand and cynical way Guildford Borough Council pushed in a proposal for 400 houses and 7000 sqm of industrial space and a 4 way junction at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common. This will entail destroying ancient woodland and encroaching on Green Belt Land. This proposal was supposed to be at Slyfield a brown field site altered at the last minute. Anyone local to the area will remember half of send marsh flooded when water came down from Clandon and Newlands corner across the A3 at the dip and flooded Send Marsh as the stream couldn’t cope with the amount of water. Remove the woods and natural soaking system is gone. Concreting over these woods is madness do we need industrial units in this area? So much for protecting Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 LAND AT GARLICK'S ARCH, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. I object to these plans as I feel there is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80 in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it. In fact, leaving Send Close to join the A247 always takes several minutes due to the traffic loads, during peak times takes a lot longer. The proposals now being brought forward will increase the traffic loads to a huge degree to an unacceptable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7912  Respondent: 10856801 / Jennifer Tigwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

This is an area of ancient woodland and should remain so.

The junction of the Send Marsh Road and the Old Portsmouth Road is always difficult and at times dangerous.

There is a 40mph on this stretch of road, and we have witnessed many accidents and near misses at this junction in the 26 years we have lived here.

Building 400 homes and an industrial site will have an effect on vehicles trying to exit the Send Marsh Road and will increase the number of accidents/near misses occurring.

There is no requirement for industrial space at this site can and should there be the need then this should be accommodated within the existing site at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6803  Respondent: 10857249 / Alice Pashley  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement-often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4510</th>
<th>Respondent: 10857249 / Alice Pashley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2117  Respondent: 10857281 / David Mandeville  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I want to object on the same grounds as probably everyone else has, There will be to much traffic, much more noise, it's Green Belt land, not enough schools in local area, the drainage system won't cope, Please build your houses somewhere else...

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6224  Respondent: 10858401 / Philip Kite  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Garlicks Arch is a late inclusion on green belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6941  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 Houses and 7000sq meters of industrial Space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road.

This is Green Belt Land with Ancient Woodland, and is prone to considerable flooding. The industrial space is definitely not needed as there is adequate space at Slyfield Green, and the owners at Slyfield are keen to have extra use there if there is in fact a need at all for extra industrial Space.

If GBC used the brownfield sites this Green Belt land would not be needed.

The gridlock that this development would cause on the local Roads would be massive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8264  Respondent: 10858977 / Angela Otterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no
exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.1 object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It makes no reference to and ignores all the previous objections made by local people who will have to live with the consequences

There is no known demand for 6 Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

This is permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” for its removal exist, and, if this occurs, Ripley and Send will no longer be separated and therefore the purpose of Green Belt will no longer exist as well

It will cause over-development and destruction of our village and 400 homes is excessive, causing excessive traffic which the roads of Send and Ripley cannot cope with. The roads are currently at breaking point and this can only make matters worse.

It is beautiful ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1 and should be left alone for future generations

This is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and already has frequent flooding

There is contamination by lead shot accumulated over fifty years

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

The proposed development of 400 homes at Garlick's Arch

I object to the development of so many homes on this site. There is no proven need for this number of houses. It is inappropriate and will overload facilities in the village. There are no special circumstances which would support this development.

I object on the grounds that this site at Burnt Common floods every year. Building would create problems for other areas of the village and potentially the road networks as well.

I object to this development on conservation grounds and am surprised that it should be considered. The area is covered in ancient woodland with trees dating back 400 years.

The Proposed Industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch

I object to this proposal because it is superfluous. The requirement for employment space need ELNA 2015 is reduced by 80% from the 2014 plan. A 40ha site with planning permission is already available at Slyfield and this development could be easily and better accommodated there.
I object to this development on the grounds that there are already a number of rural businesses adjacent providing local employment. These would disappear if this development were to go ahead.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3832  **Respondent:** 10859489 / Jennifer Procter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1 POLICY A43 GARLICK’S ARCH

1.1 **I object** to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

1.2 It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people

1.3 There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

1.4 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.5 The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

1.6 This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

1.7 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

1.8 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

1.9 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

1.10 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
1.11 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

1.12 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

1.13 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

1.14 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

1.15 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1.16 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

1.17 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

1.18 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1.19 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

1.20 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

1.21 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

1.22 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
1.23 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

1.24 I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

1.25 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

1.26 It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1626  **Respondent:** 10859585 / Irene Grainger  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to The Garlick's Arch proposal to build 400 houses and 7000 sq.metres of light/general industrial/storage distribution space on the green belt

I hope all my comments will receive proper consideration.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/677  **Respondent:** 10859585 / Irene Grainger  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:-

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople in this location which would seriously affect the value of properties.

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and "no exceptional circumstances" exist.

It will cause serious implications to the village and the number of proposed homes is excessive as our schools are already stretched to their capacity.

It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1 so should always be preserved.

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt.

It is already subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.

It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over more than fifty years.

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley which are already at an unacceptable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2556  Respondent: 10859809 / Mary Branson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A43.

It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location.

It is permanent Green Belt and no 'exceptional circumstances exist.

It is ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1.

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt.

It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6396  Respondent: 10859873 / Mat Clark  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the plan to build 400 houses at Garlick's Arch. Guildford's housing requirement has been exaggerated, and is non transparent and undemocratic. Proper use of brown field sites would be sufficient.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2402  Respondent: 10861217 / Lesley Mantell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43.

I am Objecting because 400 homes and 6 travellers sites is complete overkill and will join Send Marsh and Ripley together

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/668  Respondent: 10863969 / Joanne Rooke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development at the Garlick's Arch site. I object for the following reasons:

- the proposed housing would be on Greenbelt Land

- the potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

- the inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation. The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

- the potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

- the potential for a Waste Management Facility at site A58 Burnt Common as briefly mentioned in policy 4.4.23a does not allow for full and proper consultation.

- the increase in housing numbers from 45 to 60 at Site A42 in Tannery Lane will have a significant impact on the already highly congested local rural road network around and within Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6615  Respondent: 10864065 / Alec Mcindoe   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch because an additional 400 plus homes together with the proposed industrial site would create huge repercussions to the local environment and community. The local roads are already overcrowded, particularly at peak time in the morning and evenings. Additionally, local health care and schooling is unable to accommodate an influx of people on this scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/779  Respondent: 10865537 / Edwina Fassom   Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient woodland that surrounds the site and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2194  Respondent: 10865889 / Dreda M Todd DBO  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposed building of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be exaggerated as has the need for industrial space. The latter, if required, should be at Slyfield. The Garlick's Arch site is prone to flooding and includes ancient woodland. Development on such a large scale would be grossly disproportionate and local services and road networks would be unable to sustain it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/472  Respondent: 10866305 / Christine Reeves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site a43 Garlicks arch we don't need it. surely as we are not part of Europe and we do not have to house Europe anymore it's not needed, when are we going to realise this small country of ours is full up, this development is just about money as they all are. Come on wake up.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/567  Respondent: 10866305 / Christine Reeves  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
2) I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2531  Respondent: 10866721 / Andy Court  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 because;

There is no proven necessity for travellers sites

Again ignores thousands of previous objections

Has an excessive amount of new homes

Eliminates ancient woodland

Will have a massive impact on the amount of traffic which already is congested on a weekly basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1897  Respondent: 10866945 / Kristine Good  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses and 7000 sq metres industrial space, firstly because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. Secondly This GREEN BELT SITE is liable to flooding and it is covered by ancient woodland, providing an invaluable barrier from the noise pollution from the A3 and providing relief from air pollution caused by the huge volume of traffic flowing in this area. It is not needed as there are still brown field sites such as Slyfield which can be used, Figures from Guildford Borough Council on projected housing requirements have been shown to be grossly inflated and I believe they have yet to give details on how these calculations have been formulated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6416  Respondent: 10867009 / Paul Good  Agent:
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses and 7000 sq metres industrial space, firstly because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. Secondly This GREEN BELT SITE is liable to flooding and it is covered by ancient woodland, providing an invaluable barrier from the noise pollution from the A3 and providing relief from air pollution caused by the huge volume of traffic flowing in this area. It is not needed as there are still brownfield sites such as Slyfield which can be used, Figures from Guildford Borough Council on projected housing requirements have been shown to be grossly inflated and I believe they have yet to give details on how these calculations have been formulated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation

It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6475  **Respondent:** 10867137 / Richard Moore  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the way in which the Garlick’s Arch development was added to the local plan. There is no need for 400 houses in addition to the 13,860 proposed for the borough. This proposal has not been consulted upon. A new 4 way interchange would cause traffic chaos on already congested roads in the village of Send.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4507  **Respondent:** 10867585 / Hugh Shanks  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to, capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/462  Respondent: 10868193 / Ron and Charmian Leach  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to 400 houses being built Burnt Common and 7000 sq m. of industrial buildings. This is green belt and more building is simply not needed here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5765  Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site allocation A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, in the local plan being used for housing and industrial use: it is green belt and protected by the NPPF which prevents merger of settlements. There are NO exceptional circumstances

- I object to site allocation A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, in the local plan being used for housing and industrial use as this is a new site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously
• I object to site A43 being used for industrial use as there is no proof that it is needed and if it is needed it should be at Slyfield which is already an industrial location and where there is room to expand and where there are similar businesses. Slyfield has been turned down by GBC planning seemingly in favour of Garlick’s Arch which is a rural location.
• I object to site A43 being used for 7000sq metres of industrial space because land off the A3 slip road at Burnt Common had a proposal for industrial use and where there is already industrial use was, at the last minute, taken out of the proposed local plan.
• I object to site A43 being used for 400 houses/homes and 7000sq metres of industrial space because this land is liable to flooding, in fact the Portsmouth Road floods even with a small amount of rain. The rain drains down from Surrey Hills and the small culvert that is designed to take the flood water and the expensive work that the environment agency did about 10 years ago will not be adequate if all the proposed building is done on land at Garlick’s Arch.
• I object to site A43 being used for 400 houses/homes and 7000sq metres of industrial space because this land is covered by ancient woodland and trees from 16th century would be endangered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5776   Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object because 2 years ago there was planning submitted for 25 houses to be built at Burnt Common which was rejected by GBC. Now 400 homes and industrial use is proposed for the site! What is going on?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1354   Respondent: 10868609 / Robert Lockie   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Having lived in the area for 36 years, I feel that these changes to the plan is disproportionate and out of keeping with the historical nature of this area.

2. There is no evidence that 6 Travelling Showpeople plots would enhance the life of the local community.

3. The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is contentious in its application as it would result in the area being overdeveloped.

4. I object to the inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots in an area which currently enjoys `Green Belt’ status.

5. There is no evidence of a need for 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. The clauses relating to the possibility of these plots being used for other development in the event of insufficient interest is indicative of lack of evidence.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/714  **Respondent:** 10868737 / P Molesworth  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the statement under A43 that there is a stated opportunity that this will improve bus frequency and encourage travel to and from the site. It is hard to understand how the development of the number of houses proposed will in fact change the current occasional bus service to sufficiently reliable and frequent but service that can be relied upon for travel to and from employment.

I object under A43 the opportunity to reduce the flood risk. Any development will increase the risk both locally and in the area in general. All surface water drains to the Wey navigation which frequently overflows during periods of high rainfall and development put increased pressure on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2901  **Respondent:** 10868737 / P Molesworth  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Plans A42, A43 and A44: The village of Send and Send march have limited access, and no public transport which can be relied on for travel to employment. Therefore the creation of new homes within these areas will dramatically affect the already congested road network. It is noted that under the plan A43A there are new slip roads for the A3, and this is supported, however this will not by anyway relive the existing problem. The fact is during the rush hour periods and frequently on the weekends the A3 is congested from around the BP services to the M25. All new homes will still be served by the existing North bound slip at Ripley as it will take commuters closer to the M25. In fact it may encourage more of the existing A3 north bound traffic to travel through the over used village roads.13

I object to the statement under A43 that there is a stated opportunity that this will improve bus frequency and encourage travel to and from the site. It is hard to understand how the development of the number of houses proposed will in fact change the current occasional bus service to sufficiently reliable and frequent but service that can be relied upon for travel to and from employment.

I object under A43 the opportunity to reduce the flood risk. Any development will increase the risk both locally and in the area in general. All surface water drains to the Wey navigation which frequently overflows during periods of high rainfall and development put increased pressure on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1882  **Respondent:** 10869025 / E.J. Bartlett  **Agent:**
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist
- It will damage ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the already congested local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT strongly to this attack on the use of the Green belt in this New local Plan, which has Just been thrust upon the residents of this area of Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common.

This New Plan is a real assault on this area which, on the previous Plan, was designated about 45 or so houses placed on it, now we Suddenly told you intend to build 400 Houses plus an Industrial Development On precious Green Belt Land, Outrageous!!

This development Is totally Inapropriate and unnecessary, and will devastate the Village together with Ripley which we have lived in for thirty five years.

The amount of extra traffic that will be generated by the 400 houses Plus the new Interchange will overwhelm us all. At present it is Intolerable at certain times of the day. This will Just add to Total Gridlock, with traffic using this village as a cut through from the A3 to Woking.

The infrasructure within the village is overburdened now, let alone what will happen when this plan is ever adopted. The Roads are full, the schools are Full, and the Health Centre is overflowing especially as it now is responsible for Ripley residents also.

As a council you have a responsibility to look after your residents in rural villages, maintaining a certain Quality of Life for us all

This Plan is really Flawed and I therefore OBJECT to it. please submit this to the Inspector,

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch

Yet again you have ignored the many objections from both Ripley and Send. My main objection is to building on this protected area in the green belt (which is appalling for a Tory council to consider), in addition to which, it is not suitable anyway with its flooding potential and contaminated ground. Again the road structure around will not cope with the additional cars as it doesn't now. The need for Travellers and Showpeople plots are not at all warranted as you have already allocated some in the Send Hill area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6635  Respondent: 10869729 / Ralph Clark  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I object to the proposals A42, A43 and A44 for a total of 485 homes and 2 travellers pitches in Send on the following grounds:

1. The increased housing will bring with it at least 1-2 cars per household which will add further traffic to the small village roads particularly at peak times. These roads already struggle to cope with current traffic levels.
2. Like much of Surrey the roads around Send are in a poor state and the increased traffic in the area will only add to their deterioration.
3. The increase in population of Send will impact on services such as the Villages Medical Centre where it is already difficult to arrange appointments with the Doctors.
4. There is no need whatsoever for industrial developments in Send as raised in A43. Send is not and never will be the right location for industrial premises being a rural village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1466  Respondent: 10869857 / A.C. Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (), is Sound? (), is Legally Compliant? ()

I object to Policy A43 (Land at Garlick’s Arch). The proposal is for up to 7,000 square metres of industrial and other employment space and 400 dwellings. The industrial space is simply not required, since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space compared with the 2014 Draft Local Plan. New industrial space if required can be accommodated at Slyfield, and it is quite unnecessary to site it at Garlick’s Arch.

Furthermore, the additional traffic generated by so much employment space, coupled with the traffic generated by the 400 new dwellings and Policy 43A (new A3 intersection at Burnt Common), would overwhelm the local road network. In particular the A247, through Send to Old Woking, is likely to become completely gridlocked for much of the day, with
Potential serious consequences in terms of noise and air pollution, physical danger etc. for people whose houses front on Send road, as well as serious inconvenience to other people in the area. It has to be appreciated that Send Road ends at a roundabout in Old Woking where it debouches into narrow winding streets. There is no scope for increasing traffic capacity through these streets, which are already heavily congested at certain times. The proposals for Gosden Hill Farm and Wisley Airfield will only further exacerbate the traffic problem.

Furthermore, the additional local population from the 400 new dwellings at Garlick’s Arch cannot be accommodated by the existing infrastructure of schools, medical services etc.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1945  **Respondent:** 10869921 / Kate Haskins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )*  

I further object to the Garlick’s Arch development. 400 homes and large industrial space will create not only a crowded, unpleasant living environment, but traffic meltdown. Clearly, nobody in the local planning department is local at all, as if they were, they would already be stuck in very high volume traffic on a daily basis, and know that this huge development will bring us all to a standstill. Don’t be fooled that an additional access point to the A3 will ease this, quite the opposite, drivers will simply join the queue in a different place, and queue back onto the local roads too. I therefore also object to the new interchange, that will simply add more queues to the existing ones, not ease any congestion at all.

I have made each of my objections clear, and I hope that those I elected to represent my family and I will listen carefully to the explicit and grave concerns voiced by a whole community. Should this development go ahead regardless, it will be a very sad day for democracy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3343  **Respondent:** 10869985 / Alan Blackburn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

*Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )*  

The site is contaminated. It is absolutely ridiculous that Travelling Show People should have plots here. Have you no respect for ancient woodland. Again no thoughts of infrastructure has been given as there will be far far too much traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

*Attached documents:*

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3567  **Respondent:** 10870593 / Maureen Blackburn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/4492</td>
<td>10871329 / Lyn Gargan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is contaminated. It is absolutely ridiculous that Travelling Show People should have plots here. Have you no respect for ancient woodland. Again no thoughts of infrastructure has been given as there will be far far too much traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pslp172/218</td>
<td>10871329 / Lyn Gargan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly to the Policy A43 changes to Garlick’s Arch for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrote previously to make my thoughts known about the proposed plan and at that time thousands of other local people made their objections clear and this seems to have been ignored in the continued development of this plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not been convinced that there are exceptional circumstances for the Green Belt to be ignored and therefore changing the use to allow more development in the future without having to consult with the communities is not acceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As I said in my opening paragraphs that the plans are unnecessarily excessive in the number of dwellings to be built. Changing the very nature and fabric of our community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send and Sendmarsh are on the flood plain, which is allocated as Flood Zone 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone 2 Medium Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding; or land having between a 1 in 200 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the Flood Map)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken from: Guidance Flood risk and coastal change- Department for Communities and Local Government, Planning practice guidance and Planning system, 6 March 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The footings and excessive number of houses to be built will inevitably upset the water table and therefore could cause flooding in houses already built. This happens when the water accumulating on flood plain is displaced and has to find the easiest path. This will cause a knock on effect to so many areas, not least damage to existing houses. As has happened in Walton on Thames, West and East Mosley. As our climate changes and there could be more periods of heavy rain this will be a crucial aspect for the planning committee to address. Making sure that existing flood plains are able to do the intended role of holding access water in times of need.

The joining up of Ripley and Send will defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt, to keep green space between the communities for them to maintain their identity as a functioning community and not and amorphous mass of dwellings with no community identity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/538  **Respondent:** 10871329 / Lyn Gargan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Re: the latest changes to the Local Plan 2017 in respect of Garlick's Arch and the Burnt Common sites:

**My background:** We have lived in this house since 1981 and chose to live in this area due to its accessibility to the open countryside, the community and village atmosphere and facilities. We took into consideration the easy access for us to work in London and the environs.

Already this is becoming impossible to do in a decent time frame, as the traffic is excessive on the A3 and M25 between Junctions for the M23 and the M40. Adding so many more households with cars who will need to use these routes will make travel impossible. Taking into account the plans for a Town on Wisley Airfield, the plans for Merrow, this will only be exacerbated.

I am very aware that we need to provide more housing for young people to stay in the area, houses for older people to down size and social housing. This can be done within the area of the village envelope for Send and the village envelope for Ripley. Doing this without overwhelming the facilities and infrastructure already in place.

I object strongly to the Policy A43 changes to Garlick's Arch for the following reasons:

- I wrote previously to make my thoughts known about the proposed plan and at that time thousands of other local people made their objections clear and this seems to have been ignored in the continued development of this plan.
- I have not been convinced that there are exceptional circumstances for the Green Belt to be ignored and therefore changing the use to allow more development in the future without having to consult with the communities is not acceptable.
- As I said in my opening paragraphs that the plans are unnecessarily excessive in the number of dwellings to be built. Changing the very nature and fabric of our community.
- Send and Sendmarsh are on the flood plain, which is allocated as Flood Zone 2.

Zone 2 Medium: Land having between a 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000 annual probability of river flooding; or land Probability having between a 1 in 200 and 1 i n 1,000 annual probability of sea flooding. (Land shown in light blue on the Flood Map)

Taken from: Guidance
Flood risk and coastal change

From: Department for Communities and Local Government Part of:
Planning practice guidance and Planning system Published:
6 March 2014

• The footings and excessive number of houses to be built will inevitably upset the water table and therefore could cause flooding in houses already. This happens when the water accumulating on flood plain is displaced and has to find the easiest path. This will cause a knock on effect to so many areas, not least damage to existing houses. As has happened in Walton on Thames, West and East Mosley. As our climate changes and there could be more periods of heavy rain this will be a crucial aspect for the planning committee to address. Making sure that existing flood plains are able to do the intended role of holding access water in times of need.

• The joining up of Ripley and Send will defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt, to keep green space between the communities for them to maintain their identity as a functioning community and not an amorphous mass of dwellings with no community identity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7565  Respondent: 10872353 / Robin Williams  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The proposed industrial development is not required in this Green Belt site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7476  Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. An area which floods, is covered in lovely old woodland should not be bulldozed to over stress the local infrastructure and put in industrial areas where they should not be. What is the purpose of Sly Field industrial estate if not to accommodate industrial needs? This is another dodgy deal being done to benefit a developer with no concern to the Greenbelt or the impact on those who live here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3887</th>
<th>Respondent: 10873313 / Rob Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this and simply don't understand how the protection of green belt in this manner can be allowed. what possible exceptional circumstances cam be shown to make this acceptable? None. The inclusion now of pitches for &quot;travelling show people&quot; is a clear attempt to drive this through roughshod despite the thousands of objections you have received as by suggesting there is a need for travelling show people pitches is cynical use of a minority, by suggesting such a need even exists. You should be ashamed at your blatant attempt to bypass the protection of a lovely area to get your way and build some 400 homes to meet some central government quota which takes NO consideration of impact. This is unacceptable and should not proceed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/664</th>
<th>Respondent: 10874817 / J. I Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the 400 houses and the 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. This site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been subject to consultation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/779</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Garlick's Arch proposal (site A43) for the same reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7383</th>
<th>Respondent: 10876033 / Lucie Paulson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Garlick's Arch proposal (site A43) for the same reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1847  Respondent: 10876833 / J. C. ROBSON  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object in the strongest possible way to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores the thousands of previous objections from the local population.
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.
• This area is a beautiful Green Belt area with many mature trees from hundreds of years ago. No exceptional circumstances exist.
• An area where wildlife and plants can grow preserving our heritage.
• It is land between the A3 and the village and protects the local residents from noise and pollution from the A3.
• Green Belt is part of our village setting, it is what makes our village a village. Send residents live in a village as this is the setting Send offers: living close to protected Green Belt and not in a town.
• 400 homes and 6 Travelling showpeople plots will impact the village character of Send. Woking and Guildford are nearby to offer town amenities if required. The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots are an excessive increase to Send / Ripley and this will result in overpopulation with more traffic impacting local roads and village.
• The area around London Road / Roundabout at Shell Garage / Portsmouth Road / A247, already has high levels of traffic in all directions, not just at peak times in the morning / evening but throughout the day / night.
• This area is particularly congested between 7:15 - 9:00 AM and 16:30 - 18:30 mainly by passing through traffic, impacting the local area. These roads serve as an alternative to the A3 leading to this congestion. Often the traffic is standing still during these hours.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact traffic on these roads. These roads / junctions are unable to cope with more traffic. This will require more funding to rectify and impact locals with ongoing road works.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact the local schools - the local Send school has just been extended and does not have sufficient capacity for more. This will require more local funding.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact healthcare. The Villages Medical Centre does not have sufficient capacity at present, let alone for a substantial increase in residents. This will require more local funding.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact local air quality, water resources, ground pollution. Wildlife and flora are impacted. As the land is so near the A3 health for residents could be affected by asthma etc.
• The proposed 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots will impact the flooding situation in the area. The area is already suffering from flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4771  Respondent: 10876993 / Michael Hurdle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object -

1) This is land is Green Belt - designed to prevent sprawl and the merging of settlements. No ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been claimed – indeed there has been little time to address this or the other issues below. This site was not in the 2014 Section 18 original draft Local Plan, nor in the revised Section 19 Local Plan in April 2016, and appeared just **thirteen days** before the Council met to recommend consultation – a poor way to make significant decisions.

2) **The development is too large** – the proposal for 400 homes plus light industrial facilities represent an increase of about a quarter the size of Send village. People living there will use the Send schools and the Send-based Villages Medical Centre which serves Send and Ripley. These are currently working at capacity. 400 homes at Garlick’s Arch would provide too many patients and pupils for present arrangements, and not enough to make feasible the building of a new school or new medical facilities.

3) **Congestion** - The proposed new links to the A3 would mean a large increase in traffic through Send and at the Burnt Common Roundabout; these road are already jammed at times. It is claimed that it is not permitted to link the Garlick’s Arch site directly to the A3, so traffic to and from the site would use the narrow Burnt Common Lane, the Portsmouth Road, Burnt Common Roundabout and the A247 Clandon Road before accessing the new links, hugely adding to local traffic. Even if the direct link to the A3 could be made, MANY vehicles from Garlick’s Arch traffic would be bound to use the A247 through Send to Woking, going through Burnt Common Roundabout.

The A247 and Burnt Common Roundabout are already gridlocked at busy times; any further traffic would cause significant delays for longer periods, and consequently higher levels of traffic pollution ( diesel particulates, carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen ).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6374  **Respondent:** 10877249 / Ann Hamilton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 square metres of light / general industrial / storage distribution space on the Green Belt - there are no exceptional circumstances for this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3084  **Respondent:** 10878433 / John Townsend  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I wish to comment on the above document.

I have been a resident of Send for 13 years and very much enjoy the rural feel of the village. That said I also understand the real need to provide homes and particularly homes that can be afforded. I am therefore not against development where it is required and appropriate to the community in which it is set.

In general I do not believe that the LP you propose has housing provision which is either required or appropriate.

I OBJECT to the housing need assessment. The over provision of housing in the LP by 30% is outside government policy and places significant pressure on the borough. In addition the inability to recognise the constraints of the large area of green belt in the borough has lost an opportunity to reduce the housing need for real and legitimate reasons. Consequently wholly unsuitable sites have been identified including Garlick's Arch in Send.

The lack of any opportunity to scrutinise the assumptions of the housing need assessment was also unfortunate...and poor government.

At the May meeting of your Cabinet authority was given to the Lead Officer to add minor changes to the LP before it hit your Council meeting. Consequently Garlick’s Arch and the commercial site plus the new junction was added. This was not a minor change and I would suggest your council acted wrongly in considering the matter at Council.

I OBJECT to Garlick’s arch development. The huge increase in houses in our village will have a devastating affect on our roads and community facilities. With respect to roads your plan does not provide any information on the traffic implications in the area. Our roads are overflowing at certain times of the day, we have very few buses and no sustainable routes for cycling...and more are they propose in your plan.

Garlick’s has been badly thought through with developers interests being placed in advance of your residents.....shame on you all!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6358  Respondent: 10878529 / Phil Beddoes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to comment on the above document.

I have been a resident of Send for 13 years and very much enjoy the rural feel of the village. That said I also understand the real need to provide homes and particularly homes that can be afforded. I am therefore not against development where it is required and appropriate to the community in which it is set.

In general I do not believe that the LP you propose has housing provision which is either required or appropriate.

I OBJECT to the housing need assessment. The over provision of housing in the LP by 30% is outside government policy and places significant pressure on the borough. In addition the inability to recognise the constraints of the large area of green belt in the borough has lost an opportunity to reduce the housing need for real and legitimate reasons. Consequently wholly unsuitable sites have been identified including Garlick's Arch in Send.

The lack of any opportunity to scrutinise the assumptions of the housing need assessment was also unfortunate...and poor government.

At the May meeting of your Cabinet authority was given to the Lead Officer to add minor changes to the LP before it hit your Council meeting. Consequently Garlick’s Arch and the commercial site plus the new junction was added. This was not a minor change and I would suggest your council acted wrongly in considering the matter at Council.

I OBJECT to Garlick’s arch development. The huge increase in houses in our village will have a devastating affect on our roads and community facilities. With respect to roads your plan does not provide any information on the traffic implications in the area. Our roads are overflowing at certain times of the day, we have very few buses and no sustainable routes for cycling...and more are they propose in your plan.

Garlick’s has been badly thought through with developers interests being placed in advance of your residents.....shame on you all!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the lack of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to plan A43 the inclusion of the 30 hectares of Garlick's Arch in this Plan A43. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft, and has not been consulted on previously. It forms part of the Green Belt and is permanently protected by the NPPF, which is there to prevent the merging of settlements. It also contains around 5 hectares of ancient woodland, some of which dates back to the 16th century the plan includes the building of 400 houses and nearly 2 acres of industrial buildings and warehousing. The ENLA of 2015 shows an 80% reduction in employment space over that of 2013, therefore industrial space at Burntcommon is no longer required. Quite apart from losing Green Belt land, the extra traffic generated by an estate of this size, which will consist of about 800 cars and many HGV's, will put an unbearable pressure on all the roads around the Burntcommon roundabout (A247/B2215), especially at rush hour times. As well as the roads being unable to cope with such huge population growth, neither will the local schools or the Villages Medical Centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the building of 7000sq metres of industrial space and 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods regularly and is covered by ancient woodland, up to 500 years old, which is home to a variety of wildlife. The industrial space is not required and the additional heavy loads of commercial traffic will need to pass through Ripley village in order to gain access to the A3 and M25. There is already provision for commercial space at Slyfield industrial estate and this should be fully developed before additional sites within Green Belt locations are used. With regards to the 400 houses at Garlick’s arch, the currently existing brownfield sites within Guildford and its surrounding areas should be fully utilised before any housing is agreed within Green Field sites. Guildford has refused to share the methodology behind calculating the upcoming housing requirements and therefore no weight should be given to the use of these calculations when planning additional housing capacity.

I further OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I further OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
4. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan.

5. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.

6. I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick's Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

7. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick's Arch (Policy 43).

8. I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

[Comment ID: pslp172/4691  Respondent: 10884545 / Sarah O'Hagan  Agent:]

[Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )]

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4711</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10884993 / Dave Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3146  Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no railway station within reasonable walking distance, it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attacked documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4597</th>
<th>Respondent: 10889985 / Ruth Macdonald</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1018  **Respondent:** 10892097 / Steve Whatley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the Policy A43 change at GarlicKs Arch because:

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.

No Exceptional circumstances exist to remove this area from the green belt.

It would be an overdevelopment of our village with an excessive number of homes.

It is subject to frequent flooding and not suitable for building.

It will cause excessive traffic which will cause major congestion to Send & Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2378  **Respondent:** 10892513 / C.R. Sewter  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

- The LOCAL PLAN H1 states "Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or morewhilst there remain an identified need" Send has disproportionately been allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as all 8 travelling showpeople plots identified as being needed in the borough until 2034. The developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden Hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches a piece during the same period
- The area floods regularly and is in FLOOD Zone 2.
- All the THOUSANDS of previous objections by local people have been ignored
- There is NO PROVEN DEMAND for Travelling showpeople plots in this location.
- It is beautiful, permanent Green Belt and "no exceptional circumstances" exist.
- This overdevelopment will cause traffic problems on local roads.

---
Abide by the already agreed Policy A43 pages 144 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh. The proposed changes to the agreed Policy are not legally compliant, neither are they sound and not do they comply with the Duty To co-operate

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2839  Respondent: 10893505 / P J Freeland  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the land at Garlick's Arch being developed for 400 houses and 7,000 sq metres of commercial premises on this Green Belt site. This is a late addition to the Plan and has not been consulted on. There are no "exceptional circumstances". This scale of development at this location does not have the infrastructure to support it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6425  Respondent: 10894945 / Peter Pearce  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

Guildford's Housing Requirements seem to be rather vague and ill defined and very likely over exaggerated.

The Local Plan seems to be without adequate corroborative information as to how the Housing Requirement assessment numbers were reached, nor does it provide the arithmetic to substantiate how such numbers were arrived at.

The GBC Scrutiny Committee seem to have failed to properly evaluate the methodology employed, question or challenge the Paper paid for by the GBC to support their own view! Such failings do not seem to have been questioned by GBC Leaders when making their own assessment either by oversight or conveniently to suit their position.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6377  Respondent: 10895009 / Holly Broughton  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing
need either for the village or the borough. It was a very late inclusion into the 2016 plan. No prior consultation was held with the residents of Send Marsh. This will increase the village by 25% and is not needed.

- I object that no explanation or planning has been given to the impact on the infrastructure i.e. roads, schools, dentists, doctors, congestion, and pollution.
- I object that the building will be on a site that regularly floods. Will this push the problem further down into the village? I live in Greyfriars Road. If this development causes my house to flood I will sue the Council for any damage incurred plus the devaluation of the property.
- I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available and where developers are anxious to create this type of building.
- I object that 4 businesses employing a number of people will be forced off the land against their will.
- I object that ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century will be removed. How can you even contemplate cutting these down!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
6. **I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick's Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

7. **I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy 03)**

The Garlick's Arch (A43) proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

9. **I object to the Borough Wide Strategy (Policy S2)**

GBC's proposal for 13,860 new houses without any constraints to reduce the overall housing figure, differs from all the other Borough Councils in Surrey.

The Plan is unbalanced across the borough; there's too much development in the north east of the borough (Wisley [A35], Ripley/Send [A43] and Clandon [A25]). 36% of all the Plan's new housing is proposed in this area, which has only 11% of the existing housing.

5,036 houses are proposed between the M25 and Burpham (about 5 miles) which will obviously lead to a merging urbanisation of identities the villages .

10. **I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)**

The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements the Plan depends on. There is no schedule for Garlick's Arch (A43), so the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site. It is therefore not fit for purpose.

12. **I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)**

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick's Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed.

That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick's Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

13. **I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)**
The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick's Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

14. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II)

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick's Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. This land is ancient woodland and should be preserved. These houses and the proposed industrial buildings would link up the villages of Ripley and Send and generate a huge amount of traffic on roads which are already heavily congested. The A247 through Send is at a standstill during the morning and evening rush hours and there is a bottleneck at Old Woking onto roads which cannot be widened or improved. Other traffic going through Ripley or Clandon would also be on roads which are narrow and already congested. Councillors must know that the A3 is also often at a standstill during peak hours so why would they want to force more traffic onto these roads?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6004  Respondent: 10898113 / V A Lewis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the underhand way in which GBC pushed through the Garlick’s Arch proposal for an additional 400 houses, warehousing, and 7,000 sq.m of industrial space. It was a matter of hours between the proposal in the morning on 24th May and being pushed through to the council meeting and into the draft plan the same day, with no time for consultation or transport assessment. This requires full consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6005  Respondent: 10898113 / V A Lewis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plan for 400 houses and 7,000 sq.m of industrial and warehousing space at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. I object that the industrial and warehousing site has been moved from Slyfield where it had been on a previous plan. Slyfield is where it should be and not in a residential area and it is questionable as to whether it is needed at all.

I object that ancient woodland at Garlick’s Arch will be endangered, some trees dating to the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2852  Respondent: 10898113 / V A Lewis  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because - It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people, there is no proven demand for Travelling showpeople plots in this location, the local plan HI policy states
"Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation should be provided on 500 HOMES OR MORE, Send has been disproportionately allocated 2 traveller pitches and 6 travelling showpeople plots whereas the developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches each. Surely anyway residential developments are not suitable to this use.
- It is green belt and no 'exceptional circumstances exist
- It is overdevelopment of our village
- It is beautiful ancient woodland
- It will would lead to a large increase in traffic gridlocking local roads which are
- lane and some single track
- It is contaminated by lead shot

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Comment ID: pslp172/2521  **Respondent:** 10898721 / J Hawkins  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlick’s Arch – a proposed development that will increase the risk of flooding in the area. It would increase the traffic problems on the local roads which are incapable of coping with an influx of traffic. The local infrastructure cannot cope and more facilities such as schools and surgeries would be required.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7396  **Respondent:** 10899137 / Justina Buswell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

It is still a designated flood zone.

It will mean further loss of Green Belt and by linking Send/Clandon and Ripley almost to Burpham negates the key purpose of the Green Belt.

It will destroy ancient woodland which will increase the risk of flooding.

The excess traffic is unsustainable and will cause extra wear on already poor roads.

The area cannot sustain the increase in population and cars which would result in overloading the infrastructure.

There are gypsy sites close by and no demand for sites for Travelling Showpeople in this location.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: pslp172/3515  **Respondent:** 10899137 / Justina Buswell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I Object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. This site is covered in ancient woodland, which should be preserved. The site is prone to extensive flooding. The industrial space, if required, should be sited at Slyfield and the extra housing is surplus to Guildford’s housing requirement.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch for the following reasons: Again this change totally disregards the thousands of previous objections. It is a beautiful area of Green Belt with very valuable and beautiful ancient woodland – something which is totally irreplaceable. It is a massive development for a village of this size causing Ripley and Send to join up, something which Green Belt land is designed to prevent. Again – another development in this area will massively increase the congestion on surrounding roads, something which is already a particular problem in our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1351  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick~s Arch. This site is covered by ancient woodland the industrial space is not needed, also the site floods in the winter and concerting it over will cause flooding in either Send Marsh or the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5419  Respondent: 10899233 / Frederick Hookins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7279  Respondent: 10900065 / Jenny and Guy Marshall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
As a resident of Ripley I write to object to the local plan as the proposed development is not sustainable and I also object to the late inclusion of sit A43a Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2389  
**Respondent:** 10900609 / Beverley Gear  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to Garlick's Arch being built on as it is a site which is covered in ancient woodland and should be preserved as such. Once our history is destroyed, it will be gone forever and there will be no going back.' The local road infrastructure for Send and Ripley is not suitable if the Garlick's Arch proposal for industrial and housing developments are allowed to go ahead.

The local roads are totally unsuitable for HGV's and any large increase in general traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7340  
**Respondent:** 10902817 / TJ Deacon  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Site A43 – I object to the proposal of potentially 400 Homes and 7000 sq m of industrial and warehousing use. I object on 3 grounds as follows:-

The number of 400 is completely out of proportion to the Send area existing population

The infrastructure is already inadequate as detailed for Site A43a.

The site includes a large area of ancient woodland which cannot be replaced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4223  
**Respondent:** 10903265 / M Stokes  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I Object to Policy A43-Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley.
It is proposed that 400 houses and 7000 sq. m of industrial warehousing are built on this site. This site is NEW, was not included in Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. The site in question is within the Green Belt and includes ancient woodland with tree preservation orders in place. With regards to the warehousing why do we need this here in Send? Since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in floor space from the previous draft plan is there really a need for 7000 sq. m of industrial units here?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3566  Respondent: 10903265 / M Stokes  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

You have managed to completely ignore all the previous objections to this development and have increased the houses from 400 to 600 and added 6 traveling show people plots.

The excessive amount of traffic that will be generated from this site will cause immense congestion on already congested roads and lanes in Send and Ripley. Please note whenever there is a problem on the A3, Send and Ripley become gridlocked add in 600 extra homes and we wont be going anywhere!

Our schools are already oversubscribed we only have one doctors surgery which is already under pressure to support the local villages of Ripley, Send and W Clandon.

The site is within the Green Belt along with an ancient woodland and no exceptional circumstances exist. If this development is allowed to go ahead it will join up Ripley and Send defeating the key purpose of the Green Belt.

Why is there a need for 6 traveling show people plots? There is no proven demand for such sites in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1150  Respondent: 10904833 / Elaine Roberts-Toomey  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlicks Arch Send Marsh because this increase completely ignores all previous objections, the traffic is already terrible up to the shell roundabout at to the junction opposite garlicks arch at send march road, it will grid lock traffic all through send and back to old woking. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. Green belt should always be protected, this is a travesty that our children and grandchildren will blame you all for, Ripley and send will no longer be villages but a town we might as well rename as RIPSENDOFFLY which if approver is what you have done, who would want to buy a home on land with polluted land (lead shot) lets see you and the developer cover that one up to purchasers, ancient wood land and frequent flooding which will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1910  Respondent: 10904865 / Michael W.R. Herwig  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I OBJECT to the building of any industrial units on Garlick's Arch farmland especially as there is a 40 ha. site at Slyfield.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1691  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I OBJECT to the industrial use at Garlick's Arch when studies have shown a reduction in the need. Why put this development in the Green Belt when there are 40 ha. available at Slyfield?  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1696  Respondent: 10905185 / D White  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )  

I OBJECT to the disproportionate and detrimental amount of building proposals for the Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common area. It seems that the area is required to surrender some 38 has. of Green Belt to satisfy the financial rewards of land owners and developers.  
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1547  Respondent: 10905825 / Bridgette Hampton  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4263  **Respondent:** 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch. It was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the Borough. Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use previously developed land, but in this draft GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch, which is part of the permanent Green Belt.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
- It is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Local Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

Moreover, this site was included at the last minute with no section 18 consultation with the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4266  **Respondent:** 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). It is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space (which is highly doubtful) it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.
Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/842  Respondent: 10906145 / Joe Gervasio  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should ne no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects,

1. i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
2. ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)
The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

There lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4802  Respondent: 10910369 / Karen Doyle  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5990  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2433  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch
GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2442  Respondent: 10910753 / Heather Thompson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch
GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6685  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan
2. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick’s Arch (Policy 43).
3. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.
4. I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick’s Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7200  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan.

1. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick’s Arch (Policy 43). I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.

I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.

I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3467  Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:
- Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.
- There are no “exceptional circumstances” required to develop on this Green belt.
- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.
- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3504</th>
<th>Respondent: 10912513 / Sarah Green</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:
- Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.
- There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ required to develop on this Green belt.
- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.
- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1842</th>
<th>Respondent: 10913377 / Isabelle Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1843</th>
<th>Respondent: 10913377 / Isabelle Stevens</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4251  Respondent: 10914849 / Robert Yates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road - The site is beautiful open fields and ancient woodland. It is a crime that Green Field sites such as this are proposed to be built on when Brown Field sites are not even being considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5691  Respondent: 10915521 / Gail Freeman  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to the proposal to develop the Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common area near Ripley & Send. The plan is totally disproportionate to our already overstretched local amenities of schools, roads, doctors etc. The land is green belt and should remain that way. I also believe that the land is part of the flood defences for Send Marsh, particularly the Maple Road development where I live, and I strongly object to any proposal which endangers the welfare of me and my family.

Other sites in the nearby area are also green belt land and should remain that way. There are other brown field sites more suitable for this type of development , if it's needed at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7167  Respondent: 10915905 / David Anness  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to in particular to the scale of development at Garlick's Arch and Merrow which will produce significant extra traffic volumes into and from Woking via Send Road and Potters Lane. Neither of these roads can safely or effectively handle increased traffic flows.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7357</th>
<th>Respondent: 10915969 / Lesley Dorran</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlicks arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly object to this development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council have not taken into account the feelings of local residents and have not made it easy to raise any objections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local infrastructure has not been taken into account, in particular the greater amount of traffic which will be generated on local roads. Send marsh road already has an enormous amount of traffic during the rush hour which includes heavy goods vehicles that are totally unsuitable for a road of this width. This is obviously due to sat nav systems. The council and police have already been put on notice that unless traffic calming measures are put in place this is a fatal accident waiting to happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlicks arch is a very necessary open piece of land protecting and enhancing our environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford borough council states that they will engage in a considerable amount of public engagement but in this case they seem to have been sadly lacking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There seems to be a disproportionate amount of development within small areas ie ripley/send/clandon as compared to other areas within guildford.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The council state that they will protect and enhance our natural environment. I fail to see how the development of garlicks arch will achieve either of these objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8235</th>
<th>Respondent: 10917089 / Maria Schirmer</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Allocation A43 (Land at Garlick’s Arch, Sent Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I OBJECT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst I think we all realise that there is a need for more housing within the local borough, planning an additional 400 houses <strong>and</strong> industrial space at this site is just reckless. The A247 leading through Send barely copes with the traffic it already has. I realise the idea of Site A43a (new slip road) is designed to avoid just this but realistically it will not happen. It goes without saying that anyone looking to commute towards London will head through Send to Woking to catch a fast service to London (25 Minutes and numerous services in an hour) vs heading over to Clandon or Horsley, a journey which takes nearly twice as long and only every half hour. Many of the secondary schools closest to the area are the other side of Send, heading towards Woking. The A247 is incredibly narrow in parts and cannot be widened. Even with the current traffic there often are long tail backs along that road, especially heading towards the roundabout at Old Woking; the roads in Old Woking also are just too narrow for more traffic. Furthermore; Send just does not have the infrastructure (schools, GP, public transport, local shops etc) to cope with so many more homes / people / cars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As for the industrial site; there is sufficient land surrounding Slyfield Industrial Estate; and this should be extended first, before any additional industrial estates are contemplated elsewhere. And if Slyfield cannot be extended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for whatever reasons, there are other brownfield sites that should be considered before very precious green belt is. Heavy industrial traffic will result in hugely increased levels of noise and pollution; levels already high enough as it is.

Finally, it needs to be remembered that the site A43 is known to flood; for that reason alone this site should not be built upon. The large area of Ancient Woodland needs to be protected. Woodlands are vital to environmental air control and also our very precious wildlife; something which it sadly seems GBC doesn’t really worry or care about.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4132  **Respondent:** 10918273 / Katharine Moss  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )**, **is Sound? ( )**, **is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show People plots.

Unacceptably this ignores 1000s of previous objections

Demand for Travelling Show People Pitches is an unproven requirement

This is permanent Green Belt land and there are NO ’exceptional circumstances’.

This will result in overdevelopment with excessive homes.

This is an ancient woodland dating to the time of Elizabeth I

Ripley and Send will become one and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

It is Zone 2 flood allocations area and subject to frequent flooding

it is contaminated by lead shot

it will congest further the already busy roads in Send & Ripley

There is no infrastructure to support the residents ie medical services and all three (infant, junior and secondary) phases of education

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1814  **Respondent:** 10918497 / Darren Moss  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )**, **is Sound? ( )**, **is Legally Compliant? ( )**

3/ I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 m² of industrial space at garlics arch. The site floods significantly and is covered by ancient woodland and industrial space is not required in the vicinity where there is plenty nearby at Slyfield.
Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be exaggerated significantly and they have refused to disclose their calculations. 400 houses will have major impact to Send and Ripley and the infrastructure cannot simply cope with a development of this size. It's too big and must be removed from the local plan. This was also sneaked in at the last minute from a proposal all of 100 houses which is still too many on such valued ancient land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/307  **Respondent:** 10919105 / Susan Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to. Site A43 Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3801  **Respondent:** 10919841 / J.A. Millard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposed building of 400 houses and 7000m² industrial space at Garlick's Arch.

This is an unbelievably large development for the area. The road systems are already up to and beyond capacity and the extra road traffic from both cars and lorries will be unbelievably bad for congestion and the environment. Undoubtedly this will ruin the aspect of the focal area with regard to both Send Marsh and Burnt Common. This is a development totally disproportionate to local needs and will overwhelm local infrastructure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2794  **Respondent:** 10919841 / J.A. Millard  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to Policy A43, Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh. This is Green Belt land and should not be touched for development at all. It provides a green lung between the pollution and noise of the A3 and the communities of Sendmarsh and Burnt Common. Building on this lane will exacerbate health issues in the local community in particular those relating to respiratory problems and stress. This policy ignores the thousands of strong objections. By the local communities. This area includes ancient woodland this is rare in South East England. The development will lead to urban sprawl with the joining up of Ripley and Send. The building of 400 homes
in this area will overwhelm the local road system which is already at its limit during peak times (e.g. turning right from Send Marsh Lane onto the Old Portsmouth Road can take 20-30 minutes at rush hour in the mornings before these additional homes are included). The land is not suited to development due to its Flood Zone 2 allocation and need to be decontaminated of load accumulated over fifty years. Also, the Council has not proven the need for Travelling Showpeople plots. The bottom line is that the Guildford Borough Council has not provided evidence for exceptional circumstances to justify development of this Green Belt Land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4788  Respondent: 10920001 / Jeff Doyle  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7173  Respondent: 10920865 / Sebastian Forbes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

However, I'd be happy for some houses on Garlick's Arch and more industrial building at Slyfield. There are other spaces which are OK for housing. But all this depends on the provision of adequate roads, shops, etc etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2971  Respondent: 10920865 / Sebastian Forbes  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I have a number of points to make about the proposed extra housing around the area of Send and Ripley. It would be nice to receive answers to specific questions rather than an automated answer that goes to every writer. I refer specifically to Garlick's Arch (Policy A43) and Burnt Common (Policy A58).

Does this area actually require more housing? I have heard that this is not so.

If it really is so, I'm not against either of these areas having more houses, on condition that my points (c) and (d) are acted upon, with information about your ideas and plans; nothing has so far appeared.

It must surely be obvious to anybody, as I've said before more than once, that if you build 400 more houses, that means 700 more cars. And yet, at an AGM of our road's Association some years ago (Boughton Hall Avenue is a private road) someone from GBC actually said that 'planning for housing is obtained first, and the infrastructure will follow'. What rubbish! So, to my next point:

If you wish to add housing, what about roads? Newark Lane (and therefore central Ripley) is an appalling snarl-up every morning; make it one-way? Then what about the other way? Re-instate traffic lights at Burnt Common roundabout? Create a north-bound access to A3 to the south of that roundabout, to ease the pressure on Ripley? Add traffic lights to the A2215/Send Marsh road junction? Make the A247 through West Clandon a B road, so that you are then able to add traffic calming devices? It seems to me to be essential that all these points need to be considered *before* you begin to add more houses, yet no mention of any of these points ever appears in what we read.

Houses, please, not travellers' pitches or industry. Industry can be added to Slyfield,

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8316  Respondent: 10920961 / Mark Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The huge development at Garlick’s Arch is also poorly planned. Aside from the area having a particular conservation sensitivity, covered as it is in ancient woodland, the site is prone to flooding. The idea of putting 7000 sqm of industrial space there seems particularly inappropriate, especially with the nearby Slyfield site still relatively under-utilised and with space available. During the planning meeting held in Send recently a number of speakers decried the ‘solution’ being offered for development of the A3 in this area. Apparently the new interchange would offer nothing to route traffic away from those roads in the vicinity which currently direct traffic to the A3. Indeed this interchange would serve only to further burden the roundabout complex at Burnt Common.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7681  Respondent: 10921057 / D M Deacon  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Site A43 – I object to the proposal of potentially 400 Homes and 7000 sq m of industrial and warehousing use. I object on 3 grounds as follows:-

The number of 400 is completely out of proportion to the Send area existing population.

   The infrastructure is already inadequate as detailed for Site A43a.

   The site includes a large area of ancient woodland which cannot be replaced.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5853  **Respondent:** 10921633 / Emma Loosley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2289  **Respondent:** 10921633 / Emma Loosley  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley+

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7426  
Respondent: 10921921 / V Groves  
Agent: 

Document: Proposes Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 7000sq metres of industrial space and 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods regularly and is covered by ancient woodland, up to 500 years old, which is home to a variety of wildlife. The industrial space is not required and the additional heavy loads of commercial traffic will need to pass through Ripley village in order to gain access to the A3 and M25. There is already provision for commercial space at Slyfield industrial estate and this should be fully developed before additional sites within Green Belt locations are used. With regards to the 400 houses at Garlick’s arch, the currently existing brownfield sites within Guildford and its surrounding areas should be fully utilised before any housing is agreed within Green Field sites. Guildford has refused to share the methodology behind calculating the upcoming housing requirements and therefore no weight should be given to the use of these calculations when planning additional housing capacity.

I further OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I further OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1609  
Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  
Agent: 

Document: Proposes Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common. Due to the proposed developments in the area; of some 6300 dwellings and 7000 sq metres of industrial space, this new interchange will increase traffic in the Parish considerably. The road infrastructure around Send is just not adequate even under present conditions. It would mean grid lock on most roads around Send particularly on Send Road, Polesden Lane and Sendmarsh Road. We were assured by Councillors from Guildford at a recent Local meeting that the local road infrastructure would be improved to accommodate the extra traffic however the funds that were stated for this work were wholly inadequate and in any event the present road widths cannot be widened [which in my view would be necessary] due to existing houses on each side.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1616  
Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Sendmarsh Road. The ancient woodland will be affected and the area is subject to flooding. The industrial space is not needed and in fact some industrial units on Polesdon Lane are currently vacant. Such space should be allocated to brown field sites for example at Slyfield. The increase in population due to this development will overwhelm the Parish schools and medical facilities and as already mentioned the additional traffic will cause traffic jams particularly at peak times as well as being harmful to the health of those living next to the main highways.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2867  
Respondent: 10922017 / Arthur Thomas  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores previous objections raised by local people.
• It is in permanent Green Belt and no ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ exist.
• It will cause overdevelopment of the villages of Ripley and Send and the number of homes is excessive.
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the Key purpose of Green Belt.
• It will create excessive traffic that will block up the local roads.
• The infrastructure of schools, medical facilities, roads, etc have difficulty coping with the present level of population without having the further burden of additional homes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5957  
Respondent: 10922177 / Paul Knight  
Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)**

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6769  
**Respondent:** 10922177 / Paul Knight  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2823  
**Respondent:** 10922689 / Kathleen Grehan  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch**

I object very strongly to this development. I cannot believe that anyone would suggest such an enormous development on this land. There seems to be no joined up thinking here. The A3, the M25 and Send Road already grind to a halt many times each day simply because of the sheer volume of traffic. This not only causes delayed journeys but also air pollution from stationary cars. Such an enormous development can only exacerbate the problem as well as cause other pressures on our village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4513  
**Respondent:** 10922913 / Henry Dowson  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
4. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
5. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
6. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
7. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
8. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
9. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
11. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
12. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
13. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
14. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
15. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) being taken out of the Green Belt and used for development. Government states that need for housing is not an ‘exceptional circumstance’ and therefore there are NO exceptional circumstances to allow building on this site.

I object to the total lack of consultation and last minute addition of (A43) Garlick’s Arch. This came as a complete shock to local residents.

I object to development on the Garlick’s Arch (A43) site as it has wildlife and ancient woodland which has not been taken into account.

I object to development on the Garlick’s Arch (A43) site as it is prone to flooding and therefore unsuitable to build on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3017</th>
<th>Respondent: 10922945 / Toby Meredith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to a new proposed industrial site at Garlick’s Arch (A43). It is not needed and there is already room for the proposed 7,000m2 at Slyfield where it is already set up for industrial purposes.

I object to removing Send, Ripley, Clandon, Galick’s Arch (A43), Wisley Airfield (A35) and Gosdon Farm (A25) all from the Green Belt as it would produce an unwanted urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for these being removed, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7487</th>
<th>Respondent: 10923745 / Marwan Khalek</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses. This has not been the subject of any prior consultation and the need is not evidenced.

The proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

The development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6288</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924609 / H Perryman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the development of the site at Garlick’s Arch which is at risk of flooding. The Plan does not take into proper account the risk of flood risk, as required by National Planning Policy. This area has flooded several times in recent years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the damage to the environment as a result of the massive scale of the proposed developments. One example, the Garlick’s Arch proposal, would double the size of the local built-up area, and would destroy the ancient woodland on the site, which includes many ancient oak trees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch because there is no need for a new industrial site there when there is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common which could be used instead. A new development on the site would result in the loss of existing businesses, which employ local people and have been for there a long time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3600</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924769 / Christy Dadswell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/817</th>
<th>Respondent: 10924897 / Louis Botha</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site A43 – Garlick’s Arch:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposed industrial site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for such a site. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If the Council truly believes there is a need for such a large amount of industrial space it should be located at the current Slyfield site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the development of the 400 houses at Galick’s Arch. It was included in the Local Plan at the last possible moment, with no prior local consultation. It is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I also object to the development of the 400 houses at Galick’s Arch on the basis that the site is liable to severe flooding. The ancient woodland is a particularly sensitive area that must not be disrupted in any way.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation is required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/739  Respondent: 10925025 / Theresa Roads  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I object to the above Policy change at Garlick’s Arch which is now 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots.

Why do the previous thousands of objections appear to be ignored by the Council?

This land is green belt – the Government itself states the following:-

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another – Send and Ripley will become one if these homes are allowed to be built.
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

So as there are no exceptional circumstances why are these being ignored in respect of Garlick’s Arch that has been around for hundreds of years.

I have lived in Send Marsh for 21 years and in all that time there has never been a proven demand for Travelling show people spaces.

Already at peak times it is very difficult to get out of Send Marsh Road onto the old A3 and these homes will only generate additional traffic – additionally if there is a problem on the main A3 all the traffic filters down through the old A3.

I do not believe that sufficient thought has been given to the infrastructure of the whole area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3366  Respondent: 10925217 / AW Winterborne  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7,000 sqm of industrial space at garlics arch opposite send marsh road. the site floods constantly and is covered by ancient woodland, the industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at slyfeild; Guildford housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have not refused to disclose their calculations. with proper use of brownfield site, this greenbelt site is not needed!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6528  Respondent: 10925409 / Tina Higgins  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Local Plan which does not maximise the use of existing brownfield sites – these should be regenerated and used for housing – in particular the Social Housing which this flawed model does not correctly address. The Brownfield site at Burnt Common should be used for new housing needs and not the greenbelt site at Garlick’s Arch

- The Local Plan does not consider flooding risks (Garlick’s Arch),
- seeks to decimate ancient woodland (Garlick’s Arch),
- does not consider the impact upon wildlife (Garlick’s Arch),

and seeks to include industrial usage on a greenbelt site (Garlick’s Arch) rather than using a Brownfield site (Burnt Common)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2619  Respondent: 10925409 / Tina Higgins  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the many previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of the village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1775  Respondent: 10928769 / John Slatford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new proposal for AT LEAST 400 new homes at the Garlic’s Arch site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1675  Respondent: 10928897 / Patricia Farmer  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the new proposal for AT LEAST 400 new homes at the Garlicks Arch site. Provision of A3 slip roads at Burnt Common is a Highways England matter not Guildford Borough Council.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5692  Respondent: 10930945 / Peter Perry  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. To repeat, there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land but GBC have, for no reason, removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

It defies logic that this site could even be considered when there are so many reasons that make it wholly inappropriate:

- The site is liable to frequent flooding. The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. This area has flooded many times in recent years and therefore, the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.
- The transport infrastructure would become unsustainable
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. To repeat, there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land but GBC have, for no reason, removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

It defies logic that this site could even be considered when there are so many reasons that make it wholly inappropriate:

- The site is liable to frequent flooding. The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. This area has flooded many times in recent years and therefore, the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.
- The transport infrastructure would become unsustainable
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:

- Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.
- There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ required to develop on this Green belt.

- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.

- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7543</th>
<th>Respondent: 10933569 / Rosamund Ebdon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposals in the local plan (Policy A43. 30 ha land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing) on the grounds that this proposal is new, was not in Regulation 18 draft and was not consulted on previously and these houses are not needed on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. It is Green Belt and has a particular conservation sensitivity due to the ancient woodland. The proposed industrial development is not required and if it were it should be located in Slyfield, not on protected Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7388</th>
<th>Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed in this area; there is already an industrial area at Slyfield. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated. With proper use of brownfields sites this Green Belt site is not required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1188</th>
<th>Respondent: 10934689 / Adam Fox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is hugely excessive
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads even more than already does of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2416  Respondent: 10935009 / Richard Winton  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Garlicks Arch allocation A43

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4124  Respondent: 10935137 / Jack Winton  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Garlicks Arch allocation

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7326  Respondent: 10936929 / William McGowan  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site is inappropriate because currently it is covered by ancient woodland and is prone to flooding during periods of only light or moderate rainfall. This proposal represents poor planning and management because existing brownfield sites in Slyfield and elsewhere could be used. Furthermore, it is evident that the industrial space proposed is not actually needed but is seen as a stepping stone to further developments in the area. Owing to the notion that industrial
developments beget further developments and the erosion of the Green Belt as a result, I believe that such planning is destructive and ethically wayward. The lack of transparency over the data that supports the construction of 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch reinforces my belief about the planning. I would be grateful if clear data could be presented to support this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5836  Respondent: 10937025 / Louise McGowan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7,000 square metres of industrial space being approved for Garlick's Arch within the Green Belt. If a need for it had been demonstrated in the Plan, it could be located in an existing brownfield area such as Slyfield. Also, the land at Garlick's Arch floods and is covered by ancient woodland and therefore not suitable for housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6756  Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. If the industrial space is needed it should be at Slyfield. I object that this was introduced at the last minute with no consultation which is disgraceful.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3742  Respondent: 10938241 / Alan Brockbank  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

It seems to ignore previous objections from locals

It is beautiful Green Belt

It will be over-development
Once woodland like this has gone it cannot be brought back

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4415  Respondent: 10940673 / Carolyn Davis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed Garlick’s Arch development (A43)

I object to the development of 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial buildings and warehousing. There is no need for further housing on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is a new addition to the Plan and was not included in the regulation 18 draft: therefore it has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is an inappropriate location due to the permanent Green Belt status which prevents merging of settlements and is not an exceptional circumstance.

If there is a need for a further 7,000 sq m of industrial space, it should be at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6205  Respondent: 10940833 / Natasha Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The site was inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys.

Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence in the proposed local plan that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council may have been offered the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land, if needed, could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available.)
Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick’s Arch (Policy 43).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.  
2. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.  
3. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.  
4. I object to the impact that Policy A43A will have on the air quality for those living in the surrounding areas and for future generations.  
5. I object to the impact on residents that the resulting noise pollution of Policy A43A will have.  
6. I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required. |

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2881  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.  
- There are no “exceptional circumstances” required to develop on this Green belt.  
- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.  
- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots. |

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2882  Respondent: 10941057 / Tim Green  Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.
- There are no “exceptional circumstances” required to develop on this Green belt.
- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.
- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3735</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941153 / Michael Cox</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 Land at Garlick Arch, Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley

This proposed development of 400 homes and an industrial estate is too large for the area. Admittedly part of the site is a Brown Field site already developed for commercial uses. However the local infrastructure will be unable to cope with the large amount of traffic generated (possibly 1000 vehicles). The suggested new slip road onto the A3 northbound would help to stop vehicles going through Ripley Village. However take a look at the A3 northbound on a Monday morning during the peak time (during term time) and you will see that the traffic is stationary back to Burnt Common, therefore people will still go though Ripley Village to queue jump and that will cause a traffic jam there.

The Greenbelt was created to protect rural communities and to stop urban sprawl. The villages in Guildford Borough need this protection and therefore any plans to erode the Green Belt must be abandoned.

The proposals outlined in the Local Plan do not state how the Borough intends to address the education, health, pollution, and public transport problems that the increase in the population in the area will cause.

To sum it up we feel the number of houses proposed throughout the entire borough is far to large. The erosion of the Green Belt should must not be allowed. The increase of vehicles on the roads will increase the pollution in the area adding to health problems.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6042</th>
<th>Respondent: 10941697 / Adrian and Tina Curtis Wylde</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses at Garlick's Arch. Building 400 houses at this location would put undue strain upon the roads and facilities of Send and Ripley and contribute greatly to the creeping suburbanisation of the area. Bear in mind also the close proximity of the new houses to the pollution and noise from the A3 traffic, which will only increase in future years.
I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

I trust that due account will be take of my views.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/52</th>
<th>Respondent: 10942017 / Jason Fenwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I trust that due account will be take of my views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2506</th>
<th>Respondent: 10942433 / Brenda Ottaway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the marina will generate heavy traffic too. The road cannot take any more.

I object to the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4311  **Respondent:** 10943457 / Henry Benzikie  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I OBJECT** to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/2201  Respondent: 10944065 / Freya and John Risdon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the stream which runs through that area ends up across the road from our house, in Send Marsh Road, and it has flooded in the past. The new development would increase the amount of run-off into the stream, by replacing soft, permeable, vegetated surfaces with new hard sw-faces, and therefore increase the risk of flooding downstream on Send Marsh Road. The development site also has a particular conservation sensitivity as it includes much old woodland. I believe trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site itself is also subject to flooding.

- I also object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.
- I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4312  Respondent: 10944161 / Stephen Benzikie  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**I OBJECT** to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
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businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I2). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley, and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7405  Respondent: 10945057 / Margaret Field  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7409  Respondent: 10945057 / Margaret Field  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to all insetting of villages from the Green Belt, in particular for Ripley, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, Send and East/West Horsley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4522  Respondent: 10946721 / Gillian Allen  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3085  Respondent: 10949601 / Victoria Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlick’s Arch
as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

1. The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.

A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3087  Respondent: 10949601 / Victoria Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:  
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:  
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 ***Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3092  Respondent: 10949601 / Victoria Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1297  Respondent: 10949729 / Ivan Szabo-Toth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 , Land at Garlick’s Arch Send Marsh, because it will cause overdevelopment to the local area and will generate a level of traffic which the village cannot cope with. The village already struggles to cope with existing traffic levels.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2988  Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4) The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2989  Respondent: 10949921 / Jan Parker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I hereby wish to object to the amendments to the Local Plan having already objected to the original local Plan for many reasons, including the following:

- Any development at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation
- The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan
- The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. The Plan is self-inconsistent and therefore not properly constituted.
- The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.
- The plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing”. So even more travellers pitches and houses, which is unjustified.
- Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ...” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22,) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects: i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. This is ancient woodland plus there is absolutely no justification in that number of houses or the industrial space.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A 43 being changed to 400 homes and 6 traveller sites. You have completely ignored all the objections and the number of homes is totally unjustified. It is ancient woodland of which there is precious little left and will virtually join up Send and Ripley ignoring the reason for Green Belt. Again the traffic will be a nightmare as the roads around are gridlocked during the rush-hour every day.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3507  Respondent: 10952161 / Alison Humberstone  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this and simply don't understand how development of an area under the protection of green belt can be considered or allowed. What possible "exceptional circumstances" can be shown to make this acceptable? None.

It seems clear to me that the inclusion now of pitches for "travelling show people" is simply a blatant attempt to drive this through despite the thousands of objections you have received! Suggesting there is a need for travelling show people pitches is blatant use of a minority to get your way , even suggesting such a need even exists is ridiculous and I am sure meets some planning exception to allow you to bypass the green belt protection. You should be ashamed. Why would you use some an approach to destroy a lovely and ancient wooded area? Just to build some 400 homes to meet some central government quota which takes NO consideration of impact, you would destroy this land? appalling. This is unacceptable and should not proceed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4274  Respondent: 10952641 / Kimberly Locke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to the Garlick’s Arch land being included in the Guildford Local Plan for housing or industrial development.

Being a resident of the Send Marsh ‘Wimpey’ Estate, we overlook the Garlick’s Arch land with only one row of houses and the Old Portsmouth Road between us and the boundary to the land, and have lived here for sixteen years. We therefore have quite a ‘working knowledge’ of the area, its roads and local services.

The Site

Although the Garlick’s Arch land, from a plan view on a map, looks to be a perfect housing development site, let’s look at it closer.
Firstly, there is a watercourse that weaves across the centre of the land – this stream crosses under the Old Portsmouth Road and then along the backs of the houses opposite our home on Maple Road. This stream has flooded on a number of occasions before affecting a number of the homes in Maple Road and Send Marsh Road. I feel sure that the new development would not allow surface water drainage to be fed into our already overloaded local drainage system so the water will be discharged into the stream presenting an increased risk of flooding to our existing homes.

The land is bordered by two main roads – the A3 to the south east, and the Old Portsmouth Road to the northwest. We can hear the A3, quite loud at times, even though Maple Road is at least 500 metres distant at the closest point – Homes on the Garlick’s Arch land could be within metres of this major artery to London and the M25, placing them in Noise Exposure Category Zones C and D (Planning Policy Guidance No. 24).

1. Noise Exposure Category Zone C is classified as land that “Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.” Please note the underlined phrase – there are other local sites much more distant from the motorway network such as the Wisley Airfield site which would be much more suited to residential development.

2. Noise Exposure Category Zone D is classified as land where “Planning Permission should normally be refused.”

A proportion of the land is wooded – it would be unacceptable to lose this habitat and tree screen between the A3 and our estate.

This land is Green Belt ... other than a few houses and a small business unit, the proposed site is undeveloped fields and woodland. Wouldn’t it be better to build on brownfield sites, such as Wisley Airfield which, despite claims to the contrary, is brownfield as it has a 70m x 2.0km strip of concrete runway (14 hectares) down the middle of the site along with 1.2 hectares of other hard surface for hangers, taxiways and maintenance areas.

The Surrounding Area

The Garlick’s Arch land acts as part of a ‘separator’ between Send and West Clandon, helping to maintain the individuality of the villages rather than allowing them to melt together into one large mass of housing.

Local Roads, Infrastructure and Services

• The increased traffic flows onto the Old Portsmouth Road from an additional 400 homes on the Garlick’s Arch land would only make the already appalling traffic conditions here worse. In the morning it often takes 5-10 minutes to turn out of Send Marsh Road onto the Old Portsmouth Road, there are traffic queues into Ripley Village, there are queues and the Burnt Common Roundabout, there are queues trying to get into Send Village, and accessing the A3 southbound can be a challenge (and you have to go through Ripley if you want to go north on the A3).

• The few local schools – Send Primary and Ripley Primary – are already full to bursting point. Between them, they have only 90 places to offer every year and their buildings would not take further expansion without massive investment, the overloaded surrounding roads inadequate already to deal with the daily school-runs.

• It is already difficult to get to see a Doctor on the first day of an illness – an additional 1800 people (400 homes with two adults and 2.7 children) would make it impossible to get medical advice when you need it at the local surgery.

• Local services and organisations – such as Send Help, Little Owls Nursery, Send and Ripley Scouts and Guides are all current stretched to the limit ... the area just cannot take any more people.

I realise that my one voice doesn't count for much, but mine is one voice in a crowd of other voices all quoting the same thing, "Please, not Garlick's Arch!".

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from...
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
A43: Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send March

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show People plots

- I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
  - It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
  - There is no proven demand for Travelling Show People plots in this location
  - It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
  - It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
  - It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
  - It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
  - It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
  - It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3764  Respondent: 10953569 / Karen Church  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write with reference to the local plan and in particular the changes to the site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley. In section 4.2 Housing Policies, Policy H1 section 7 states:

(7) Accommodation for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople (whether they meet the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites definition or not) accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need. For 500 to 999 homes two pitches or plots should be provided, for 1,000 to 1,499 homes four pitches or plots, for 1,500 to 1,999 homes six pitches or plots and for 2,000 or more homes eight pitches or plots.

The land at Garlick's Arch is proposed to have 400 new homes built on it making it too small a development to include accommodation for travelling show people.

The impact of the 400 new homes (excessive for the size of the site and surrounding area) in the small village of Send and the impact on the traffic on the Portsmouth road can only be made even worse with the addition of the large vehicles, that usually travel in convoy, that are associated with travelling show people.

The future of the area and indeed the whole country is going through a period of extreme change and uncertainty following the country's decision to leave the European union. Foreign investors who bought property and left it standing empty purely because it would increase in percentage value better than any bank interest rate have stopped buying property. There has also been a slowdown in migration into Britain from EU countries. This will reduce the strain on the housing market and hopefully the government will put steps in place to get some of the hundreds of thousands of empty properties in the country available to rent or buy. I strongly believe we should protect our green belt land and keep our villages within it. There are may steps that can be taken to improve the housing situation without concreting over the south east of England.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4205  Respondent: 10953793 / Hugh Thomas  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch being brought forward as a last minute proposal without any warning and without it having been mentioned at all in the earlier Draft Local Plan. This attempt to push it through under Regulation 19 instead of Regulation 18 and thereby deny residents a proper process of consultation is a further manifestation of the contempt in which Guildford Councillors hold the electorate. This is a clear breach of administrative law.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch because the site includes ancient woodland, too valuable to destroy. The site floods as photographic evidence and local testimony can confirm as a result of the East Clandon stream overflowing and surface water being trapped.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch since this would increase the number of dwellings in Send (including Send Marsh and Burnt Common) by about 25% without a commensurate increase in services and infrastructure. There is already severe pressure on doctors’ surgeries, school places and other essential facilities which would seriously worsen. Infrastructure issues are substantially the responsibility of Surrey County Council but there is no evidence that SCC has formulated an infrastructure plan, or the means by which the infrastructure would be paid for, in respect of this site or any other site. What we were told at one public meeting, that the council thinks about infrastructure afterwards, is typical of a woefully inadequate approach to the whole Local Plan.

I OBJECT to 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch because the space is not needed since there is inadequate take up of existing space in the area, but if it were needed it would make very much more sense to locate it at Slyfield. In any event Garlick’s Arch is an unsuitable location for industrial space given the proximity of existing houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4192  Respondent: 10953921 / Alan Knox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4289  Respondent: 10954209 / Anita Wilkinson  Agent:
I OBJECT to this policy

Comments: gridlock on the Portsmouth road, particularly when considered together with the Wisley Airfield proposal!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches  
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people  
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location  
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.  
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.  
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.  
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.  
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.  
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.  
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.  
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7507  Respondent: 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1407  Respondent: 10956161 / Pauline McCallister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

1. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks
Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. a)The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. b)The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4636  Respondent: 10957025 / Pauline Masters  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one
another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3283  Respondent: 10957313 / R Holmes  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Proposed site is Green Belt. All Green Belt land must be protected.
- Significant adverse effect on quality of life for existing local residents and the character of the locality.
- Local Infrastructure is totally inadequate.
- Access road network not adequate: the traffic along the A3 is at a standstill at some point most weekdays (and some weekends) between Burpham and the A31 Hog’s Back junction and northbound at peak times towards the M25 at junction 10. If there is a problem on the A3 northbound towards the M25, Motorists try to beat part of the traffic jam by taking advantage of the B2215 London Road slip road to continue via Burnt Common and Ripley and filter back onto the A3 near Wisley. Obviously this causes even more Queues on Local Roads. If there are any major incidents on the M25, again local roads become more congested than normal.
- Local Link Road Networks would not cope with the added number of cars, let alone cans and lorries. There are already queues at peak times on the A247 at the old Woking roundabout the Burnt Common Roundabout and the B2215 into Ripley
- Much more pollution for the area – noise, light, air.
- Site covered by ancient woodland.
- Potential for increased crime and nuisance (Nearest Police station was in Ripley but has now been closed)
Community Issue Re Housing: Medical Centre in Send Barns Lane (Shared with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley) – Difficulty Getting Appointment Now and no public transport operates along send barns lane to the centre.

There are no busses towards Woking on a Sunday at present and bus times (Mon-Fir) would need to increase at peak times and later in the evenings back from Woking railway station (Last bus back to Send/Ripley is currently 19:30 hrs)

The cycling network is not adequate or safe. It will be even worse if more cars, van and Lorries come into the area. If the council really mean to encourage more cyclists then the cycle lanes need to be separate from the roads. Putting dotted lines on the roads is no good and not safe.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2750  Respondent: 10957313 / R Holmes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regard to public transport, I mentioned that he last bus back from Woking mainline railway station was at 1930hrs. This service has been cut and now the last bus back from Woking that goes past Send Marsh Green and then Burnt Common is at 1820hrs. this time is unacceptable for any commuters/daytrippers and will mean an increase in the number of cars using the already congested roads.

I not only object to the 400 homes but also to the additional proposal of 6 travelling showpeople plots for the same reasons as set out in my original objection response dated 15 July 2016.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/66  Respondent: 10957441 / Christopher Hunter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the inclusion of Garlick's Arch development in new local plan.

Gbc have not only failed to follow correct process but this policy A43 was introduced in cynical, dishonest manner without due consultation. The site is green belt covered in ancient and precious woodland with trees and wildlife we have a duty to safeguard.

The industrial development is not required at this site - if indeed it is at all required, which is questionable, then Slyfield is the obvious choice.

The roads between Ripley, Send and Guildford are already gridlocked in rush hour. To increase traffic by allowing this proposal is detrimental to health and welfare of community; dangerous for area with high numbers of children - and grossly negligent to what is permanently protected green belt land.

I strongly object to the Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch and urge you to reject this proposal.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1555  Respondent: 10957441 / Christopher Hunter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the inclusion of Garlick's Arch development in new local plan.

Gbc have not only failed to follow correct process but this policy A43 was introduced in cynical, dishonest manner without due consultation. The site is green belt covered in ancient and precious woodland with trees and wildlife we have a duty to safeguard.

The industrial development is not required at this site - if indeed it is at all required, which is questionable, then Slyfield is the obvious choice.

The roads between Ripley, Send and Guildford are already gridlocked in rush hour. To increase traffic by allowing this proposal is detrimental to health and welfare of community; dangerous for area with high numbers of children - and grossly negligent to what is permanently protected green belt land.

I strongly object to the Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch and urge you to reject this proposal. I object to taking away Send's GREENBELT status. I object to proposal for new A3 interchange at Burnt Common. There is too much pollution and congestion with existing houses and traffic. I would like my objection to be shown to planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1564  Respondent: 10957441 / Christopher Hunter  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 at Garlick's Arch because it ignores the huge amount of previous objections made by local people such as myself.

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and the over development of our village and the number of homes proposed is totally excessive.

The impact on our roads is very worrying and dangerous as lots of local children walk and cycle to school and the roads cannot cope with any more traffic and congestion.

The negative impact on destroying the Green Belt is obvious and this must be protected at all costs. Frequent flooding would be much worse and natural habitats for animals and insects destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site (Policy 14).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/ further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as it is classified as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The site is wholly inappropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4235 | Respondent: 10959009 / Rebecca Claridge | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which
forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch Ripley as a strategic site in the draft Local G B C Plan and please remove this as a strategic site
I consider that the Green Belt in Surrey needs protecting and object too on that basis
Please remove Garlick’s Arch and other Green Belt sites in Horsley and Ripley as well as former Wisley Airfield (Three Farm Meadows) from the draft Local Plan

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1861   Respondent: 10959425 / Jan Lofthouse   Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

OBJECTION
Green Belt Ripley and Horsley Surrey – PLEASE REMOVE Garlicks Arch and other sites on green belt land from the Draft Local Plan

I object to the draft Local Plan including Green Belt areas in Ripley Surrey and Horsley as well as Former Wisley Airfield Ockham

Please remove Green Belt sites from the draft Local Plan

There is plenty of land within the Guildford Borough for development without touching Green Belt

Richard Rogers renowned Government Advisory Architect has confirmed that there is no need to touch Green Belt Land for development in England

There is plenty of derelict land to develop

Developers are sitting of enough land to meet all housing needs but land bank, for profit

Why not address this and encourage development on land held by commercial developers?

Please remove Green Belt from your draft local Plan and retain the green belt sites and ensure Surrey villages are protected from monstrous developments overwhelming the size of the villages and hamlets

Please do not change the status of Green Belt Sites in Guildford Borough

I object on this basis to the draft Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3517   Respondent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett   Agent:
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was brought to our attention at the very last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation with the residents and is not required in terms of housing need by either the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. Should there be a credible need for this space, it should be located at Slyfield where there is already an industrial estate and there is a 40ha site available.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3518  Respondent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett  Agent: 10959457 / Maria Niblett

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Similarly, I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses. The late introduction of this site into the Local Plan, without any prior consultation, is solely due to the availability of private funding for the proposed new interchange proposal at Burnt Common in conjunction with the Wisley development. It would never be considered for development on its own merit due to its ancient woodland and its susceptibility to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7424  Respondent: 10959681 / James Bryer  Agent: 10959681 / James Bryer

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5240  Respondent: 10960033 / Lucinda Kalupka  Agent: 10960033 / Lucinda Kalupka

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6629  **Respondent:** 10960257 / Craig Church  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I write with reference to the draft local plan and its impact on the Green belt and in particular the villages of Ripley and Send. I am a resident in Send Marsh and moved to this area three years ago specifically because it was in the green belt and therefore should be protected from over development. Whilst I can understand the need for some expansion in the housing stock and I am encouraged by the number of brownfield sites in the local plan, the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial units and warehousing at Garlick' Arch, Burnt Common on green belt land is completely over the top. It is not in keeping with the housing density of the surrounding area and there are no plans to increase any services to
support the potential 800 people and their children that could live there. The road network around Ripley and Send cannot support the extra traffic that this number of properties would generate. There are already long queues through all the villages at rush hour with the current population.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6482  **Respondent:** 10960353 / Trish White  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4431  **Respondent:** 10962657 / Amanda Leader  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk.
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6022  Respondent: 10962689 / Martin Ladd  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge.
concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4450  Respondent: 10962689 / Martin Ladd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6761</th>
<th>Respondent: 10962785 / Derek Gilmore</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/15  
Respondent:  10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  
Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I am emailing to register my STRONG objections to the new proposed local Guildford Plan.

I object: Firstly, the proposed development at Garlicks Arch, site A43 is on green belt land - this land is protected and should NOT be built on. There is no need for this communicated by the Local Plan documentation.

I object: The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be harmful to the rural nature of the villages of Ripley and Send. These are small rural villages that will be destroyed with this level of development. Please listen to its inhabitants!!!! This increase is not justified by the local plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2471  **Respondent:** 10963137 / Gabrielle Erhardt  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object: The allocation of 6 travelling Showpeople plots with storage facilities is completely inappropriate for the rural area. Associated traffic will also be a great problem.

I object: Whilst the Plan (Section 4.2.22) states that there are sufficient sites for 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople - why do 6 of them have to be in Ripley???? This is unfair and badly planned.

I object: The plan is inconsistent in regards to the travelling Showpeople plots - according to the 2017 plan, these plots are also designated as housing. This plan is poorly thought out and is inconsistent.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5904  **Respondent:** 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. No consultation took place on this, and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5907  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without transparent justification – if indeed it can be justified. Furthermore, the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7638  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on Send and Ripley at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice, without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the villages or the borough.
2. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding. Any development here would be permanent and in perpetuity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4205  Respondent: 10967489 / Jenny Jackson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 ‘Garlick’s Arch’

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan. NB: A travelling showpersons site with associated storage is completely inappropriate in a rural environment, and I note the intention to release this land for additional housing in the future, should it prove an unnecessary allocation.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm… (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”

The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (Burnt Common and Garlicks Arch – which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives. A58 Burnt Common provides more than the “required” industrial space, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4521  Respondent: 10967649 / Ian Cornwall  Agent:  

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming even more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of Industrial space at Garlicks Arch for the following reasons:

- on environmental grounds: this is on ancient woodland and on largely undeveloped land. If additional industrial sites are required they should be on brownfield sites for example at Slyfield or if really needed in the area at Burnt Common, where there is already some industrial development

- the addition of this number of houses would alter the character of both Ripley and Send and would put significant additional strain on the infrastructure (roads, schools, health)

- the development was not mentioned in the previous consultation document

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2904</th>
<th>Respondent: 10969601 / Jenny Paviour</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the development at Garlick Ash for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2528</th>
<th>Respondent: 10969985 / Guy Middleton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
- It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1688  Respondent: 10970337 / Chris Crawshay  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the 30 hectares of Garlick's Arch in this Plan. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft, and has not been consulted on previously. It forms part of the Green Belt and is permanently protected by the NPPF, which is there to prevent the merging of settlements. It also contains around 5 hectares of ancient woodland, some of which dates back to the 16th century.

Any further industrial space required could easily be accommodated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/4384  Respondent: 10970497 / Michael Cook  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the
Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will
place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no
certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),
Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1879</th>
<th>Respondent: 10970817 / Lee Crane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because again it ignores the thousands of previous objections, there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location. There are no “exceptional circumstances” existing to justify removing the area from permanent Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6264</th>
<th>Respondent: 10972065 / Sarah Cocke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2885  Respondent:  10972385 / M.E. Firingstein  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the latest changes to plans for the above villages.

1. GARLICK’S ARCH (POLICY A43) KILN LANE SENDMARSH.
2. CLOCKBARN NURSERY IN TANNERY LANE, SEND (POLICY A422)
3. BURNT COMMON – PROPOSED SITE FOR MIN: 7000sq.m. INDUSTRIAL SPACE (POLICY A58)

Whatever happened to ‘Green’? our green belt up to now has been jealously guarded. Your intentions to [illegible word] our villages beggars belief!

The roads around this area are choked with traffic jams every whichway.

What about the need for schools, medical facilities, sewage drainage-plants: and returning to problem of extra traffic many families have 2 or 3 cars per household. and extra POLICE STATIONS? needed?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/277  Respondent:  10972833 / Robin L. Smith  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A43 - Garlick’s Arch

- Ignores all the thousands of previous objections
- What case is there to dump Travelling Show People at this location
- It is Green Belt and these policies are not "Exceptional Circumstances"
- Change the current the whole nature of Sendmarsh beyond recognition
- Destruction of Woodland that has been in existence since Elisabeth I
- Ripley and Send will cease to be separate entities - just one continuous housing scheme
- The traffic flow is already terrible at rush hours and no plan (a3 extra access) will alleviate this - such proposals are hogwash and trying to coin people

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4447</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10986689 / Richard Harris</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6113  Respondent: 10987745 / Ian Pigram  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common on two counts; that there is no demonstrated need for the extra housing or industrial and warehousing (ideal for brown field sites such as Slyfield) space following the ELNA in 2015; that this site contains ancient woodland, our richest land based habitat, which need proper protection, not destruction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4398  Respondent: 10987841 / Marion Bastable  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common on two counts; that there is no demonstrated need for the extra housing or industrial and warehousing (ideal for brown field sites such as Slyfield) space following the ELNA in 2015; that this site contains ancient woodland, our richest land based habitat, which need proper protection, not destruction.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4400  Respondent: 10987841 / Marion Bastable  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3) Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4401  Respondent: 10987841 / Marion Bastable  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

. ** I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4402  Respondent: 10987841 / Marion Bastable  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5) The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7033  Respondent: 10987905 / Marika Chandler  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4633  **Respondent:** 10987905 / Marika Chandler  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3934  Respondent: 10989601 / Margaret Mew  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3913  Respondent: 10990145 / Anne Lee  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of
this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

I OBJECT to policy A43.30 the development of new four way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already crowded and vulnerable to traffic jams. Further traffic from this development would result in permanent gridlock. It simply would not work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7748  Respondent: 10990785 / Valerie Golding  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses and 7,000 m2 of industrial units because according to the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a 80% reduction in the requirement for employment floor space from the previous draft plan. I also object in the way it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation. This is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough Approx 50% of the area is subjected to flooding, it contains two Ancient Woods Which do have some protection under the NPPF guild lines clause 118 this, amount of development will destroy the woods. Space exists at Slyfield for the industrial units and the residential property should go into Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6800  Respondent: 10992225 / Emma Ringshaw  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is for making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light to local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, and these will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4582</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>10992225 / Emma Ringshaw</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no need for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but
The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch. It is harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7995  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1632  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to the latest changes to the plan.

I object to Policy A43 , Land at Garlick’s Arch Send Marsh, because it will cause overdevelopment to the local area and will generate a level of traffic which the village cannot cope with. The village already struggles to cope with existing traffic levels. The number of homes is excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1633  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 , Land at Garlick’s Arch Send Marsh, because it will cause overdevelopment to the local area and will generate a level of traffic which the village cannot cope with. The village already struggles to cope with existing traffic levels. The number of homes is excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1676  Respondent: 10992801 / Martine Szabo-toth  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to object to the latest changes to the plan.

I object to Policy A43 , Land at Garlick’s Arch Send Marsh, because it will cause overdevelopment to the local area and will generate a level of traffic which the village cannot cope with. The village already struggles to cope with existing traffic levels. The number of homes is excessive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3354  Respondent: 10992833 / Amanda Verny White  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.
Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/177  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Garlick’s Arch proposed development because of the impact on already overcrowded local roads and services. Also, there will be increased flood risk in Send Marsh due to increased water run off into local stream. My home is already in a flood risk area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2169  Respondent: 10995233 / Pam Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2052  Respondent: 10995297 / Peter Cormack  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5249</th>
<th>Respondent: 10998081 / David Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( )</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch. The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6683  Respondent: 10998913 / Brian & Amanda Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Fifth, the Garlic Arch development, right on our doorstep, would ruin the area we chose to live, cause health hazards from air pollution and is just not necessary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2709  Respondent: 11000385 / Sheila Robins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8056  **Respondent:** 11001761 / Brandon Sievering  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch. This has been slipped in at the very last moment without proper consultation. The added 400 houses will cause overcrowding of our schools and doctors surgery. Our Villages Medical Centre is already over subscribed and difficult to get doctors appointments. Another 800 minimum people would completely swamp this facility. The 7000 sq mtrs of industrial area would also increase the amount of Commercial Vehicles in the area using the local roads. We hardly need industrial buildings, as past developments have stood empty for years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2030  **Respondent:** 11003361 / Howard Milner  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. This will create unsustainable amounts of traffic on the already extremely busy Send Marsh Road and Portsmouth Road. The queue of traffic is often down as far as the Saddlers Arms pub. It will become impossible to get onto Portsmouth Road with any additional houses or industrial space.

Some of the new development is intended to be "affordable" housing. Surely it makes more sense to build these closer to the areas, and public services, where jobs are based, i.e. Guildford itself, to prevent increased volumes of commuters down the A3? Why doesn't Guildford Borough Council consider building 'upwards', on existing or redeveloped sites, instead of destroying woodland in the Green Belt?

In addition, building on this site increases the risk of flood, in an area already prone to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1339  **Respondent:** 11003361 / Howard Milner  **Agent:**

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common, Policy A43

This is partly ancient woodland, and the proposal to develop it with a mix of industrial warehousing and residential properties would undoubtedly lead to the loss or damage to these ancient trees, plus the resultant run off of rainwater would increase the likelihood of flooding to properties including my own further downstream, it would appear that no consultation with the environment agency who recently invested in flood defences along our stretch of the East Clandon Stream has taken place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to your Policy A43,

Again you have ignored all previous objections and offered no alternative plans to alleviate the concerns of local residents.

No demand for Travelling Showpeople has ever been shown or proven to exist.

The government is at this time reviewing in a White Paper its housing policy to protect " Aged or Veteran Trees and Ancient Woodland" yet you are proposing to build over them!

The land is in a flood zone 2 category area and any development will undoubtedly increase runoff into the East Clandon Stream which has in the past flooded local properties and is at this time being re surveyed by the Environment Agency.

This proposed development will also increase pressures on local roads, Schools and Medical facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1097  Respondent: 11003681 / Elizabeth Milner Agent:

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my strong objections to the 2016 Draft Local Plan.

The NPPF prevents the merging of settlements without any exceptions. There are no exceptional circumstances.

Why has this been proposed?

I object to the proposed development of land at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common. Policy A43/A43a. There are ancient woodlands at Garlick’s Arch and this area should be conserved, there are trees dating back to the 16th century which could be felled or damaged. Also adding 400 homes and 7000 sq m of various types of employment space as well as new 4 way junction for the A3 would cause significant stress on local services and roads, which are already unable to cope. This site presents a significant change from the Regulation 18 consultation in 2014. Where is the infrastructure??

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1335  Respondent: 11003681 / Elizabeth Milner Agent:

Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 – Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh
Travelling Show People plots in this location? **There is no demand.** The number of homes is too great and will cause over-development of our village. **Our wonderful, beautiful ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I cannot not be chopped down.** The government is at this moment reviewing the protection of ancient woodland and greenbelt. **Send and Send Marsh are already subject to flooding frequently and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.** Lead shot has accumulated over fifty years so parts of the area is contaminated. **Send and Ripley and local areas are already too congested with traffic this proposed development will just exacerbate the problem.** The traffic noise is already at an unbearable level.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to proposal A43 concerning housing development at Garlick’s Arch. I object because the development means the loss of ancient woodland, rare in this area, which is home to local fauna, notably hares in this instance, and which is full of bluebells in spring. I object because I believe the woodland helps to keep noise from the A3 at bay, protecting Send Marsh residents in particular. I object because the villages of Send, and indirectly Ripley, are ill equipped to accommodate such a large development. I object because there is a very poor bus Public Transport network linking the villages to Guildford, Woking and towns further afield, and it will additionally mean more environmental damage with everyone relying on their private vehicle because of the lack of buses. I object because for Send this means an increase of 25% in the number of residents and it is not fair that one small village should be swamped by this development. I object because the villages do not have the required infrastructure: overstretched medical facilities, a lack of Junior/Primary School spaces, insufficient shops, as well as a paucity of Secondary education places in this area, meaning children being transported at cost by numerous coaches morning and evening to ensure they arrive at their place of education. I object because the Portsmouth Road will become even more of a nightmare owing to congestion from traffic. I object because a much smaller housing development was rejected a few years ago and the same reasons for the application being turned down then still exist (the refusal stated that the application represented inappropriate development in the Green Belt and also was unacceptable for various reasons because the site was within the 400m to 5km zone of the Thames basin heaths Special Protection Area - has the TBHSPA moved?), so I fail to understand this more recent, unexpected, proposal.

I object to this proposal A43 in addition on the grounds that an industrial site is totally out of keeping with the locality and totally undesirable adjacent to a housing development. The proposed four way junction on the A3 here is, I
understand, being facilitated by the permission granted to the landowner for the housing development. I object that this payback is disproportionate. I object because it suggests that financial greed is an overriding factor in considering this development, not a well considered plan to provide accommodation for a needy population.

I object to proposal A43, i.e. the north and south bound slip roads onto the A3 which were considered inappropriate when the road was constructed. I object because the local residents will suffer undesirably from the increase in traffic and noise. I object because some of the adjacent land is currently farmed and increased pollution will be unacceptable. I object because it will bring yet more traffic from outside the village through Send, especially large vehicles, and there is already an issue at peak travelling times along the A247 including Send Road, Send Barnes Lane and Broadmead, not to mention the road through West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

My second objection is to Policy A43 where 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots are now proposed. I have already objected to the number of proposed new homes and these objections stand. Now I would like to know: What evidence and which "exceptional circumstances" are being used as justification for this new requirement? The proposal to remove an ancient woodland with its wildlife population and replace it with residential development and Travelling Showpeople Plots is ignominious. The development here will create one vast housing estate in combination with the Send Marsh (Wimpey) estate on the other side of the road and more or less join up Send and Ripley.

I see no way in which Send and Ripley can accommodate such an increase in demand for medical facilities, schools and shops. I am sure you can also see that there will be another inevitable increase in the traffic using the local roads which are already busy and congested for a large part of each day. Here I will point out the speeds of the vehicles travelling along Send Barnes Lane in the vicinity of Send Primary School. There is a real danger to the school children at the start and end of the school day. The attempt to reduce speed by moving the speed restriction sign has not been very effective.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as it is classified as Green Belt. There are **no exceptional circumstances** which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

Central Government state clearly that housing need is **not** an exceptional circumstance.

The site is wholly inappropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5210  Respondent: 11007073 / Gyles McIver  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E3)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick's Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6967  Respondent: 11007393 / James Culmer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5229</th>
<th>Respondent: 11007425 / Kate McIver</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick's Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3193</th>
<th>Respondent: 11007713 / Grahame Crispin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 (400 houses & 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch).

The site includes ancient woodland which must NOT be encroached upon by any extent.

Additional traffic and noise will severely and adversely destroy the Green buffer between the A3 and Send.

Adoption of this policy and will set a precedent for further development along the A3 corridor between M25 and Guildford.

All traffic into and out of this site will route through Send’s already busy roads, and industrial area will generate unacceptable levels of heavy vehicle traffic.

Send must NOT become a Local Rural Centre.

The site must NOT be developed and the Policy must be abandoned

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: pslp172/670  Respondent: 11008033 / Sandra Reeves  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch as it again completely ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people. I feel very strongly that this will cause over-development of our village with an excessive number of houses which will destroy ancient woodland, which is permanent Green Belt land where no "exceptional circumstances" exist. As well, it will generate excessive traffic which existing local roads in Send and Ripley will not be able to cope with. We already have frequent traffic chaos from traffic using the village as a cut through from the A3. The proposed development will also join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt. I also object to the siting of Travelling showpeople on this site when there has been no proven demand at this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1833  Respondent: 11008225 / Russell Pascoe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1154  Respondent: 11008737 / Louise Whitbread  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object. As a local resident I object on the grounds that 400 home & substantial industrial building will put significant strain on the local infrastructure particularly the already busy roads and in terms of the homes strain on the doctor surgery & local schools with no outlined plan to mitigate the risk. The requirements to pay “significant regard to the ancient woodland within the site” does not guarantee all said woodland will be protected and preserved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3141  Respondent: 11009825 / Sally Baker  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 400 houses together with 7000 sq metres of industrial buildings at Garlick’s Arch. Many of us in Send live on a flood plain with an archaic drainage system and we do not wish to have this exasperated; Garlick’s Arch is also subject to flooding and is on a higher level. I feel strongly that this is not the area for industrial buildings – this is a village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4259  Respondent: 11010145 / Julian Ottaway  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch. There is no justification in destroying fields and woodland, there is absolutely no justification for adding traffic to an already overburdened road system. You may consider that the Ripley By Pass was constructed to alleviate the traffic in the area. What possible motive is there to completely negate the
purpose of the by pass. Every morning the main A3 is blocked from the M25 back to Burpham. Great idea to put 400 houses to add even more traffic that tries to cut through our villages.

The council is elected to represent the views of its residents, not to empire build.

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/307</th>
<th>Respondent: 11010145 / Julian Ottaway</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an area of fields and woods that is absolute green belt land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no justification for 'travelling showpeople' sites as there is no requirement for 'shows'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The road system could not possibly cope with the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most mornings the A3 the Portsmouth Road, Send Marsh Lane are grid locked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be untenable and ridiculous to consider this proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3451</th>
<th>Respondent: 11010401 / J M Bates</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk roads.
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3386  Respondent: 11011041 / Alan C Burchett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch

I object to this development.

The infra structure of Send, Ripley or Clandon could not possibly support this size of development. The roads, schools, doctors etc. are already over stretched.

This is a Green Belt site of ancient woodland that is prone to flooding. It would be totally wrong to build factories or houses on it. What is the evidence that we need additional industrial space? Also it appears that the housing needs of Guildford are being hugely exaggerated.

Even if there was a need for this development this site would increase the traffic flow onto the A3 and the M25 which are already extremely overburden. It can take 45 minutes to travel three miles south on the A3, past the Wooden Bridge bypass, almost every day during busy periods. Not to mention Northbound towards the M25 which can be at a standstill for long periods on a very regular basis.

Why was this development not listed on the original Local Plan? How could such a huge development be such a last minute thought? It sounds extremely suspicious!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4194  Respondent: 11011585 / Martin Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed industrial site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for such a site. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If the Council truly believes there is a need for such a large amount of industrial space it should be located at the current Slyfield site.

I object to the development of the 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch. It was included in the Local Plan at the last possible moment, with no prior local consultation. It is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. Also the site is liable to severe flooding and the woodland is a particularly sensitive area that must not be disrupted in any way.

I object to the fact that this site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously. Full consultation must take place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2262  Respondent: 11011713 / Mary Warren  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 I object to the development of Garlick's Arch. This is supposed to be an area of permanent Green Belt with ancient woodland from Elizabethan days and, so far, no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to explain why the land should be used for development. The addition of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots is unnecessary. This is the entire complement of this type of plot required of Guildford Borough Council. Why are all to be at Garlick's Arch when it is an area of outstanding beauty?

In addition, this area is prone to flood with a flood zone allocation 2. If developed, this flooding will be intensified to the detriment of the surrounding countryside.

I am still unclear where all the children from this development will go to school. Send School has no capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2315  Respondent: 11011713 / Mary Warren  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 I object to the development of Garlick's Arch. This is supposed to be an area of permanent Green Belt with ancient woodland from Elizabethan days and, so far, no exceptional circumstances have been put forward to explain why the land should be used for development. The addition of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots is unnecessary. This is the entire complement of this type of plot required of Guildford Borough Council. Why are all to be at Garlick's Arch when it is an area of outstanding beauty?
In addition, this area is prone to flood with a flood zone allocation 2. If developed, this flooding will be intensified to the detriment of the surrounding countryside.

I am still unclear where all the children from this development will go to school. Send School has no capacity.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3160  **Respondent:** 11011969 / Diana Gibson  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. The Garlick’s Arch site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt which is protected under the National Planning Policy Framework. It also represents unrestricted sprawl. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. The site is also subject to flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5262  **Respondent:** 11015617 / J Fiona Harris  **Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to building 400 houses and 700 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This land, opposite Send Marsh Road has the distinguished heritage of being ancient woodland. It is inappropriate to consider building on such land, not only because of its provenance, but also because it tends to flood. Industrial buildings, even if they are genuinely required, would be better sited at the existing Slyfield industrial estate. Guildford’s housing needs have been markedly over-estimated: no calculations as to how the supposed number of new houses required have been made available for scrutiny. This serves to further undermine Guildford Council’s position.

If new houses really do need to be built, a far more sensible approach would be to utilise brownfield sites. Once green fields and woodland have been submerged in concrete they are lost and gone forever. Not just for our generation. Not just for the time being. For generations to come. What an appalling legacy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I object to the proposed development of Garlick's Arch (both residential and industrial) and Gosden Hill because it breaches green belt and would be an example of ribbon development with building creeping down the A3.

I object to the way that Garlick's Arch was incorporated into the local plan at the last minute without proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Land at Garlick's Arch (Policy A43):

This potential ribbon development along the A3 will, as above, clog up already busy local roads, which are already struggling to cope with ever increasing traffic volumes.

There is widespread opposition to the excessive scale of the development proposed, which will blur the distinct village characters of Ripley and Send by making the whole area just one large dormitory.

I object to the provision of traveller plots, [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

15.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4567  Respondent: 11023585 / Jean Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore,
there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes under the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripple, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/162  Respondent: 11024225 / Julian Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Garlick’s Arch proposed development because of the impact on already overcrowded local roads and services. Also, there will be increased flood risk in Send Marsh due to increased water run off into local stream. My home is already in a flood risk area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2167  Respondent: 11024225 / Julian Harnor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
• It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/109  Respondent: 11024385 / Alison and Peter Parrott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build a large amount of houses on site A43 due to the land being Green Belt and also the affect it would have on the already overstretched infrastructure.

Also I object to a new junction with the A3 because it would create a new through route to Woking through Send, which is already very congested at certain times.

Also These major changes to the original plan need a full consultation.

Please make my comment available to the inspector

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1387  Respondent: 11024385 / Alison and Peter Parrott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a43 because this is a massive over development of send and the green belt.

Also the gap between Ripley and Send would be closed defeating the object of green belt land

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7345  Respondent: 11027137 / I Pennells  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send

- The land is floodplain for Clandon Stream, putting housing in this area at risk of flooding as well as housing further up and down stream due to no replacement floodplain being provided.
- Area of ancient woodland and associated wildlife will be impacted on by the developments
- The local adjoining roads do not have sufficient capacity (especially at rush hour) to take additional traffic that would be generated by this development.
- The proposed industrial usage is not required. There are currently empty units next to the existing industrial area and the nearby Slyfield industrial estate.
- Public transport is not sufficient meeting demand of potential additional passengers to encourage vehicles to be left at home to undertake local journeys.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4246  Respondent: 11028481 / Emma Rowland  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/337  Respondent: 11029409 / John Lay  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

5.) The inclusion of land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh / Burnt Common and Ripley ( Policy A43 )
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pssl2/3586</th>
<th>Respondent: 11031713 / Stephen Barter</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because once again it ignores the huge number of previous objections made by local people. It will effectively join up the villages of Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt. Also, there is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location; it will generate further traffic on the already congested roads of Ripley and Send; and it worsens the already considerable risk of flooding in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pssl2/688</th>
<th>Respondent: 11031937 / Patrick Ollington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the 2017 Revised Local Plan by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for the following reasons:

Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Greenbelt Land.

The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation.

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5267</th>
<th>Respondent: 11032385 / Celia Guthrie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. The site is prone to flooding and is covered by ancient Woodland. The industrial space is not required, or should be incorporated within existing industrial sites at Slyfield. Proper use of Brownfield sites should also be used to prevent this incursion into the Green Belt. Guildford’s housing requirement has shown to be exaggerated, therefore disputing the need for these houses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1985  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. Send Marsh/Burnt Common/Ripley

To the building of 400 houses on this site, Because it was not include in the regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted upon.

It is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances to take this site out of the Green Belt.

The site is covered in Ancient Woodlands, containing trees that have stood since the 16th Century, this area must be conserved for future generations.

I object Policy A43 cont… to the Warehousing and Industrial units which are included in the Policy.

Employment Lands Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 shows an 80% reduction from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013 for employment space.

If Industrial and Warehousing units are required, I question why the Cassidy Slyfield Ltd. North Slyfield site, allocated in 2014 By Guildford Council for Industrial and Warehouse use, was withdrawn from the Local Plan recently.

Surely expanding an existing Brown field industrial area is better than creating a new one on Green Belt Land!

Also heavy traffic would be attracted to Garlick’s Arch site from the M25 and A3, a lot of it also using the A247, which is not suited to this traffic!

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals are voted on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/440  Respondent: 11032705 / Mike Tarrant  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )
I object to Policy A43: Garlick’s Arch. Send Marsh/Burnt Common/Ripley.

Because, the addition of self-build and custom plots. Development is not required or wanted.

I object to the addition of 8 Travelling/Show people pitches. Because, the Local Plan H1 states that Traveller or Travelling Show people accommodation should be provided on developments of 500 homes or more. This development is for 400 homes, so does not meet the required criteria.

Because, this site is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements ie Ripley/Send Marsh/Send. There are no exceptional circumstances to take this site out of the Green Belt.

The site is covered in Ancient Woodlands, containing trees that have stood since the 16th Century, this area must be conserved for future generations.

I object because, this site is subject to flooding and has a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4434</th>
<th>Respondent: 11032801 / Louise Springfield</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clndon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clndon, Burcham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7247  Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object that the plan for Garlicks Arch (A43) was added in the late evening of the day of the Council executive meeting, just a week before the full council passed the draft local plan for public consultation.

I Object that there are no provisions for any infrastructure around Garlicks Arch (A43), there are already issues with getting existing children into primary and secondary education around these villages. The Drs requires at least a two week wait for an appointment, the mobile library no longer serves the local area and the lanes are constantly full of fast moving traffic. This is totally unsustainable.

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on off ramps at Garlics Arch. (A43a) This is just not sustainable nor has it been thought through. It will draw huge numbers of cars into the area which is already at traffic capacity, causing a huge detrimental effect to the villages in the area. Once the vehicles are heading to or from the site, they are immediately in local minor roads, which are not designed for the traffic load which will occur, even if none of the new housing and warehousing were built this plan would be unsustainable. With the new housing figures there will be huge extra numbers of cars trying to gain access, via West Clandon, where two lorries cannot pass at some point, through Burnt Common and Send where the traffic is residential all through the villages of Send and Old Woking, and the roundabout at Send, Old Woking, cannot possibly deal with such new traffic flows. This has not been thought through at all, it will bring the entire area from the M25 to the A3 and all the surrounding villages to complete Grid Lock, which will have huge impact to the health of those living in these areas.

I Object to the damage of the Historic Environment and woodland at Garlicks Arch (A43) building will double the building on the area and the ancient woodland including over 80 mature trees and associated plants and animals will be lost forever.

I Object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule C, which takes no account of the proposed use of the land at Garlicks Arch and is therefore not fit for purpose.

I object to the lack of infrastructure planning for the sites Policy I1, which does not take account of Garlicks Arch at all, and for other sites it just appears to use existing infrastructure, when in these villages all services are at capacity currently.
I Object to the poor air quality which will inevitable result from such huge development in such a small area, this can only led to greater pollution not just for the construction of the homes but also for their use, and that of associated vehicles which can only harm the existing residents and also the health of the new residents too. The area is already polluted by the A3 and the M25, increasing the land use for housing to such an extent can only add to this already difficult situation for those living here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

| Comment ID: pslp172/3847 | Respondent: 11033057 / Jo Komisarczuk | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I strongly object to: The plan A58, land at Burnt Common, London Road was I believe removed from the previous version of the plan, which they claimed at the time was why they could now add A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch. So why is it back, bigger and worse for anyone living in the area?

I strongly object to the use of Green Belt for anything as it is a way to stop villages merging and also being the lungs for London and our area. These were the stated purposes when the Green Belt was set up, so what exactly has changed?

I strongly object to A43 Garlick’s Arch, this new plan is against our wishes, with thousands of objections already made by local people. There is no infrastructure to support any such building, as these quiet country roads and lanes are already overloaded and often jammed, particularly during rush hour and at the school times. This is a beautiful, green permanent Green Belt area for which no exceptional circumstances have been given for removing it from the green belt, which are required by the National Planning Policy. The proposed development of this land will join the villages of Ripley, Send, West Clandon and the hamlet of Burnt Common into one large conurbation, which when included with other proposed plans within the local plan, will extend as far as Guildford Borough goes towards Leatherhead, including East Clandon and the Horsleys as well as Wisley and Ockham; basically into one large mass of housing. The number of homes required in A43 is totally excessive and unnecessary, and we can all be assured that these will not be homes for local young people but large four plus bedroom, mini mansions especially as the council has given the builders permission to pay their way out of building affordable homes in policy 4.2.23. The land at A43 Garlick’s Arch is frequently flooded, and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation, it is across Burnt Common Lane from me, so I know how often is floods, and that the water has even got into the gas mains on several occasions in the last decade. The land included an ancient woodland area, which can never be replaced; why remove this and all the creatures that live within it? The history around it, this area was very popular with the Tudors, and their history is part of our villages. Why are travelling show-people plots suddenly needed in this part of Guildford, there has never been a request for such before. It also is inconsistent with A50 Whittles Drive Normandy, which has approximately 14 sites that more than covers the need, therefore what reason is there to build even more in A43 Garlick’s Arch?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/1902 | Respondent: 11033825 / Peter Heath | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
I object to building 400 houses and 7,000 metres of industrial Space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. I object because this land is designated as Green Belt. It is also known that drainage in this area is bad, noise from the A3 will blight properties, traffic and population density will be considerably increased without any proposed improvement in infrastructure. If Industrial Space is required, it should be sited at Slyfield or the original proposed area of Ewbank's Auction House at Burnt Common.

I object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because increased traffic from proposed sites at Wisley Airfield, Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm (approaching 6,000 houses in total) that needed to reach Woking and its railway connection with London, would have to go through Send. Send Road is already overloaded with traffic - its roundabout connection at Broadmead with Old Woking is always a stress point now -this extra traffic will swamp it! Noise and pollution levels, already dangerously high, will become toxic!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
It will remove the green break of ancient woodland between Send and Ripley. The site is flood zone 2 allocation and frequently floods.

Excessive traffic will be generated and block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/782  **Respondent:** 11034113 / Julia Gaudelli  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

And I object to the term ‘Inset’ being used to to mean ‘Remove from the Green Belt’. The correct term is ‘Remove from the Green Belt’.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2230  **Respondent:** 11034817 / Nick Pycraft  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space. This area is prone to flooding. It also has ancient woodland, just the kind of specific area the Green Belt was established to protect.

The industrial space is also unnecessary, based on the current Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA). This shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

I also understand that Slyfield actually has a large area which would be much more suited.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2917  **Respondent:** 11035809 / Trevor Osborn  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

---
I also reiterate my objection in 2016 to A43, Land at Garlick's Arch that this is overdevelopment and the local infrastructure will not cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I Object to the site A43 Garlick’s Arch

Garlick’s Arch is a 100 acre site of Green Belt and ancient woodland which should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the 2017 Revised Local Plan by Guildford Borough Council (GBC) for the following reasons:

Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Greenbelt Land.

The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation.

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

...
I object to the huge amount of additional housing and the Industrial development at Garlick’s Arch. The Area is green space and is not suited to this level of development, the road system can only just cope currently particularly in 'rush hour' times and is often at a standstill when there are hold ups on the A3 and traffic diverts along the Old Portsmouth road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1707  Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to POLICY A 43.30 ha LAND AT GARLICK’S ARCH Burnt Common 400 house and 7,000sq metres of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses or even as many houses as the new Local Plan states are needed (13,860) - neither is there any need for the additional 7,000 sq metres of industrial and warehousing space. If there is a need for more industrial space it could easily be developed on the existing industrial site at Slyfield. A new 4 - way A3 interchange to service this development (which for the reasons stated above) would therefore not be needed. In addition there is photographic evidence of flooding on the site. If it were developed it would destroy the village communities of Send, Ripley and West Clandon and their quality of life and health and cause major problems in relation to Road Safety.

I OBJECT to the fact that POLICY A 43.30 ha is a NEW site not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt land permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. *There are no exceptional circumstances.* It is a sensitive conservation site covered in ancient woodland and trees which have been there since the 16th Century and which would then be endangered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1252  Respondent: 11036705 / Brian Slade  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change - Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh because, where despite thousands of objections it is now proposed that 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots are constructed despite there being no proven demand for Showpeople Plots in this area which is permanent Green Belt with no "exceptional circumstances" containing ancient woodland dating back to Elizabeth 1 that GBC are proposing to destroy. It is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation having frequent flooding and is contaminated land with lead shot following 50 years of shooting activity. The proposed development will generate excessive traffic on roads that already get gridlocked in Send and Ripley at peak times and also join up Ripley and Send which is contrary to the key purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7223  Respondent: 11036737 / Charley Penny  Agent:
Areas of Garlick’s Arch are known for flooding and with increased building works it means more surface run off and higher likelihood of flooding in other areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Policy A43 Garlicks Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches for the following reasons:

- it ignores all the many previous objections by local people
- there is no proven demand for the travelling show people plots in this location
- there is no proven need for the houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect, inflated and ignores constraints
- I object to Garlicks Arch being removed from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy (NPPF) requires exceptional circumstances for Green Belt boundaries to be altered or for development on Green Belt. None have been demonstrated here justifying the proposed boundary changes. The loss of Green Belt here will result in urban sprawl and neighbouring villages merging into one another. There would be harm to openness and permanence to the Green Belt itself, loss of amenity and encroachment on the countryside, contrary to paras 79-80 NPPF.
- this area is at serious risk of flooding. Why has the Council’s own flood risk assessment (SFRA) ignored the risks as set out in the environment agency’s flood map? This says the site is in a flood zone 3 from a river, which is highest risk category. Yet the SFRA puts it at zone 2. The commissioned assessment is therefore not fit to be relied on to support this policy in the local plan.
- I object to the potential loss of Ancient woodland on the site. The ancient woodland surrounds the site on 2 sides and runs through the centre of the site which includes over 80 ancient oak trees dating back to the year 1600. The proposed development would have a permanent and detrimental impact on this woodland.
- the plan does not provide an achievable strategy for sustainable infrastructure around this site. Roads are already at capacity. The villages of Send and Ripley are suffering severe congestion now, and there is no plan for this to be improved.
- this site has been added to the plan at the eleventh hour, has not been properly thought out, and no infrastructure, including roads, water sewerage, utilities, etc have been planned. This is incompetent and tantamount to neglect on the part of those drawing up this local plan.
- I object to the loss of rural employment on this site. The Policy A43 as it stands threatens the loss of 4 existing successful rural businesses, which have existed for over 30 years, and another 2 businesses for over 9 years both of which support many jobs. They do not wish to lose their premises. They support many in employment.

This policy (A43) is unplanned, contrary to National Planning Policy as specified above and unrealistic. I object to it being in the draft local plan 2017.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Greenbelt Land.

The potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch is extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation.

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7399  
**Respondent:** 11037313 / Debbie Greener  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of Send from the Greenbelt and the proposed development of over 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, this is a ridiculous proposal how do you expect the local community to accept this? Where will these people send their children to school, go to the doctors etc etc - the local public services are stretched enough as it is.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4331  
**Respondent:** 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/4830  
**Respondent:** 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy (A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000 sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1080  Respondent: 11039681 / Bruce Jeffreson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

1. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3284  Respondent: 11040193 / Jill Stevens  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the building of 400 houses and industrial development at Garlicks’ Arch. The area is marshy and the woodland is particularly endangered, with very old trees which must be preserved. The traffic, particularly at rush hour times, which is dreadful, will be vastly increased in this area and the infrastructure at present is at bursting point. Our doctors and schools will be unable to accommodate the vast new numbers of residents in this area, if development goes ahead.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2941  Respondent: 11040609 / Simon Long  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4023  Respondent: 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO 400 homes and 7,000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch opposite the end of my road. This Green Belt site is should not be used when there are other spaces that can be used . Slyfield is already a site for industry and is a more appropriate area for the proposed industrial space. It is totally out of order to mix industrial space with a residential area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3850  Respondent: 11040705 / Patricia Cullimore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43) Garlick’s Arch. Because why should you build on this beautiful Green Belt site, which already has sufficient houses in the area, when there are plenty of more appropriate sites around the Guildford area where there would be less overcrowding? We already experience a great deal of traffic at certain times of the day and building here will just add to the congestion. I was at risk of being flooded in 2000 and am concerned that the infrastructure will not support additional building and will increase the threat of flooding again in the area.
I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch. There have been travellers using the fields behind my house over the last 12 months and they have left the fields in a dreadful condition.

[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

It will take a great deal of money to restore the land to its former use for agriculture.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4375  Respondent: 11041025 / Debra Somner Fraser  Agent: 11041025 / Debra Somner Fraser

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3332  
Respondent: 11041121 / Catherine Dean  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

This site had been previously considered and rejected before the previous draft of the Plan. The site was then inserted in the Draft Plan only hours before its publication without any consultation. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. This is a cavalier approach to public engagement by the Council.

1. The site is not a sustainable site, being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

1. The site is susceptible to flooding and development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and near the site. See my comment on Policy P4 above.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

1. The Council appears to view the development as an enabling site to obtain land and developer funding for slip roads on/off the A3. This is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking Green Belt land. The slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential, Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

1. The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement, often at speed. (During the last week of the consultation period of this Plan, a resident of West Clandon had his car written off by a negligent car driver coming the other way and occupying 2/3 of the road at an obvious pinch point which is typically littered with broken wing mirrors.) It has narrow bends with...
poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford. There is vague talk in the plan of link roads between Gosden Hill and Garlick’s Arch, all meeting at an enlarged A3 intersection at Burnt Common. The existing intersection is unlit and is accident prone. Adding two or three slip or feeder roads at this point will add to the confusion and public danger

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – Objections**

- The amount of land to be taken out of the Green Belt seems well in excess of the space needed to build 400 homes. What will be the fate of the excess land?
- Garlick’s Arch (A43) is an unsustainable location. The nearest station is about 1.5 miles away and the bus services are infrequent. Residents will be dependent on cars.
- There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
- Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. The development will cause additional traffic on the A3 and the A247 and B2215 in Ripley, Send and West Clandon.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

I object to the late addition of the A43 Garlicks Arch site to the plan. Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. The Plan proposes that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. local residents were only aware of this inclusion following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

---
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

There is an abundance of wildlife in this area, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. There are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

15. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch.

The industrial space is not needed, but if it were this is not a suitable location for it. There is an established industrial zone at Slyfield, and any additional requirement should be located there.

If 400 houses were built on this Green Belt land the character of the local community would be totally transformed. Existing roads would not be able to cope with the additional traffic – they are already severely congested at peak times – especially if the proposed site at Gosden Hill Farm proceeds plus the proposed new A3 interchange at Burnt Common.

There are already difficulties in obtaining appointments at the local Medical Centre and the local primary and secondary schools are already over-subscribed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: | pslp172/3057  | Respondent: | 11042369 / Huw Williams  | Agent: |
| Document:   | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local residents
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated with lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the roads of send and ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: | PSLPS16/5723  | Respondent: | 11042433 / Sam Thompson  | Agent: |
| Document:   | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

If there was a need and local support for additional housing, there is an old disused farm on Portsmouth Road, closer to the village that is already for sale with an access road already there that could accommodate additional housing that would not be at risk of flooding, this would be a much better site in Ripley to build more housing, albeit only if school provision and doctor surgery provision was increased to accommodate the rise in housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

If there was a need and local support for additional housing, there is an old disused farm on Portsmouth Road, closer to the village that is already for sale with an access road already there that could accommodate additional housing that would not be at risk of flooding, this would be a much better site in Ripley to build more housing, albeit only if school provision and doctor surgery provision was increased to accommodate the rise in housing.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4355  **Respondent:** 11043073 / Ingrid Botha  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I **object** to the proposed industrial site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for such a site. The Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If the Council truly believes there is a need for such a large amount of industrial space it should be located at the current Slyfield site.

My son, Luke Botha, age 8 would also like to raise his objection I relation to the proposed development at Garlic arch. As a resident of the area and as the future of our country I think the children should be listened to. They see things simply and as they are and without political bias or financial motivation.

“I think it is a bad idea to build houses and factories at Garlic Arch, because you will chop all the trees down and the air will become more polluted for the people living here. There will also be lots more cars and trucks and they
will make lots of pollution too. I think it is a stupid idea because all the trees and bushes will be destroyed and all
the animals and birds that live there will die. I don’t think it will be a good place to live because it will be really
noisy and dirty living next to the A3. I think the roads are too busy and it isn’t safe for the children to cross the
road, like at the school. (Send First school)” – Luke Botha, age 8

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2148  Respondent: 11043425 / Melinda McLean  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelers sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Traveler plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017
Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A34 Garlicks Arch as this development
site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2473  Respondent: 11043553 / Geraldine Banks  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a
shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars
for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will
cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this
important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be
used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling
development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory
purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of
this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4696</th>
<th>Respondent: 11043553 / Geraldine Banks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</th>
<th>is Sound?</th>
<th>is Legally Compliant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4525</th>
<th>Respondent: 11044129 / Christopher Barrass</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/271  Respondent: 11044161 / Kerry Denholm-Price  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlics Arch with particular reference to the specific points listed below.

Given the area is classified as Green Belt the A43 changes fail to demonstrate that an ‘exceptional circumstance’ exists which would justify development of this scale on a Green Belt site.

The increased development proposed under the A43 changes exacerbates the disproportionate size of the development in respect of both locality and the contribution to the overall target for new development in the wider Borough being assigned to the area. The number of homes now being proposed for the site represents over-development of the Send Marsh area and would result in the joining up of the villages of Ripley and Send which is fundamentally against ‘Green Belt’ principals.

The land represented in the A43 changes provides a valuable natural flood control in an area that already struggles with a high water table and periods of flooding in winter despite the installation of extensive flood control channels. The proposal to replace this natural area of flood defence with housing on the scale proposed in the A43 changes would further exacerbate flooding in the wider area to the detriment of the local residences and infrastructure and as such is at best a misguided proposal and at worst an irresponsible one.

The local road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the demand of existing traffic further development as proposed in the A43 changes will overload the existing road systems to the point of gridlock and result in increased pollution exposure for the villages of Ripley, Send Marsh and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1369</th>
<th>Respondent: 11044353 / Michael Frayn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1039</th>
<th>Respondent: 11045185 / Paul Chapman-Hatchett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already significant traffic issues through Send, the road infrastructure in Send will be unable to cope with increased traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is designated Green Belt and should not be developed, especially with so many Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have concerns about the impact such a large industrial development will have, especially HGV traffic and light pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5420</th>
<th>Respondent: 11047169 / Margaret Sherborne</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to a large development at Garlick’s arch because it is a flood zone and is covered by ancient woodland. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations, With proper use of brownfield sites this Green belt site is not needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4135  | Respondent: 11047201 / Peter McGowan  | Agent: |
I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site is inappropriate because currently it is covered by ancient woodland and because it regularly floods. This proposal represents poor planning and management because existing brownfield sites in Slyfield and elsewhere could be used. Furthermore, I understand that the industrial space proposed is not actually needed. The proposal to build 400 houses seems extraordinary in terms of the lack of transparency over the data that supports building this number of houses in this location. I would be grateful if clear data could be presented to support this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

I object as it is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7393  Respondent: 11048001 / Robin Dorran  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
2) I object to the inclusion of the land (A43) at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common as it forms an important green buffer between the A3 and Burnt Common with a large area of Ancient woodland together with wildlife and IT IS GREENBELT.

The Council have numerous brown field sites and land which would be better suited for this kind of development

The land is liable to flooding and there has been no FRA (flood risk assessment) carried out

The inclusion of this site would overburden the villages of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7257  Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch, site A43. It follows from what I have said above that there can be no justification, on the grounds of exceptional circumstances, to remove Garlick's Arch, from the Green Belt. I FURTHER OBJECT the proposal to build at Garlick's Arch, 400 houses, 7000 sq m of warehousing and a four way junction with the A3. This proposal was not included in the original 2014 draft Local Plan nor in the revised one introduced earlier this year. So if it is so essential, why has it only been introduced as recently as 11th May this year, tacked onto the end of the agenda at a meeting of the Council Executive? This stinks of a developer led proposal, a conclusion that is justified by the owner of the land offering it to the Council free provided he is allowed to build 400 houses. If the Council had thought that development on this site was appropriate, why had they not included it in either of their earlier proposed plans? They knew the land was there - it did not suddenly appear like an Icelandic volcanic island! The first time this was even publicly mooted was 11th May. That allowed less than 14 days to the full Council meeting on 24th May which was intended to adopt the plan and put it to the Inspector. It is manifestly obvious that this proposal must have been in the offing for some considerable time prior to 11th May. The conclusion is clear and inevitable: the Council knew how controversial this proposal was going to be and sought to introduce it in as low key a way as possible allowing virtually no time for residents to object. it was a cynical and underhand attempt to subvert the democratic process and to stifle debate, to ensure that the proposal reached the Inspector rather than being fully considered at a full Council before its inclusion in the proposed plan. The intention clearly was to have a 3 line whip on the members of the overwhelming majority Conservative Group to nod it through - which is precisely what happened. Proper public consultation did not happen. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature.]

There is no clear evidence that there is any need for the proposed 13,860 houses in this plan, let alone that 400 of them should be at Garlick's Arch. The almost 14,000 figure of "needed" houses also fails to take account of planning constraints. The Council has refused to disclose how it has reached its SHMA, and there has to be strong suspicion that it has placed excessive weight on the number of students in the Borough, who are not permanent residents, disregarded the number of empty homes in the area, and over-estimated the effects of immigration - which, though they could not have known this at the time the plan was prepared, may now, since "Brexit", be lower even than originally anticipated as indicated at 1) above.

There is no demonstrated need for 7000 sq m of warehousing at this location. The Employment Needs Land Allocation of 2015 suggests there should be an 80% reduction in employment floor space. This warehousing was originally intended to go onto the existing Burnt Common site a few hundred yards to the south-west, which at least had the benefit of being an existing industrial site. Garlick's Arch, both as a potential industrial site and for housing, is inappropriate. It is not only Green Belt land, but much of it is Ancient woodland, and as such even more deserving of preservation. The belt of woodland provides a visible and audible barrier for residents on Portsmouth Road, Burnt Common, from the A3. Parts of
the site are prone to flooding - and indeed were under water in January this year. If there really is a need for such warehousing, it should be at Slyfield industrial estate off the A320 between Guildford and Woking. That site was originally to be extended, is low quality land with few houses in the vicinity and could have access improved by the provision of a new access road and junction in the Clay Lane area to and from the A3. It simply makes no sense to create a new industrial site, let alone on a green belt site with Ancient Woodland on it, when there is space available at an existing industrial location. Astonishingly, in writing to those acting for the proposed developers at Slyfield, that land was described by the Council as "sitting in a high sensitivity parcel", not to be developed "unless there is strong justification for doing so". Garlick's Arch however, in the same correspondence provided to me, was described as "medium sensitivity". North Slyfield is assessed as "contributing more towards the purposes of the Green Belt" than Garlick's Arch. This is surely astonishing that an area that is both Greenbelt and Ancient Woodland should be so lowly regarded. It seems to me that the Council is deliberately overstating the sensitivity of the land adjacent to Slyfield - poor quality boggy marsh, and understating that of Garlick's Arch because it is determined to build at the latter and not further develop Slyfield. This conclusion is strengthened by the next thing the Council said to those acting for the Slyfield developers... "it" (Garlick's Arch)... "has in addition to the benefits of meeting our industrial need, significant further benefits in that it facilitates a new on/off slip with the A3. We also consider that the site is more accessible to the strategic road network compared to the North Slyfield site which will assist HGV access to and from the site with less impact on the local road network and residents".

The Council's conclusion takes no regard of the effect on people living in Burnt Common, Send Marsh or Send itself, who would have their already overcrowded roads laden with even more HGVs. The proposed junction is the real clincher. This is the real reason the Council wishes to develop Garlick's Arch - to provide a junction that will assist the proposed developments further afield at Wisley and Gosden's Farm. They have not been honest about this, but Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common are to be sacrificed on the altar of developer-led building to allow the Council to reverse its decision to refuse the Wisley airfield proposal. It clearly fears "planning by appeal" given the applicants are a wealthy Cayman Islands based company who can afford to fight the refusal. The junction is not needed at Garlick's Arch and the effect on the area of this proposal is out of all proportion to its supposed advantage. The infrastructure in the area, roads, sewers, medical facilities and schools, are already at full capacity. They simply could not cope with the additional burden imposed by the Garlick's Arch proposal. The proposed junction would not merely service the immediate area. Traffic using the M25 clockwise and intending to go to Woking, instead of leaving at junction 11 or 12, would leave at 10, thus avoiding some of the delays that build up from that junction, travel the short distance, 2 miles, down the A3 to the new junction then leave there and travel along Send Road, already at full capacity morning and evening, adding to pollution and noise.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3910  Respondent: 11048481 / Patrick Oven  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
by the back door clearly to limit the public's right to legitimately object. There is clear collusion between the landowner and the Council. This policy utterly stinks.

2) There is absolutely no demonstrated need for 6 travelling showpeople's plots at this location. Policy A50, Whittles Drive, Normandy, provides all the plots of this nature that are likely to be required within Guildford Borough. There is no evidence to show that these additional ones are needed. Indeed in the Plan there is discussion as to how these plots could be used for housing in the event they are not taken up by showpeople - hardly a ringing endorsement of the "need" for them!

3) Within the limited scope for objections provided by the manner in which this proposal was introduced in 2016, there has been massive response from the residents of Send, Send Marsh and Ripley against this proposal last year. This has been totally ignored by the Council, other than to remove the proposal for 7000 sq. m of warehousing/light industrial from Garlick's Arch and move it to Burnt Common, policy A58, and increase its amount to a minimum of 7000 sq m. Clearly the reason for the removal of the industrial use from Garlick's Arch is to allow space for further house building on this site later - facilitated by the proposed insetting of this site from the Green Belt, along with the rest of Send and Ripley.

4) This is at present, Green Belt land. As such "exceptional circumstances" have to be proved to allow development on it. No such evidence has been provided by the Council, who seem intent on simply insetting the site from the Green Belt to avoid having to show reason to permit development on it.

5) Building on this land will lead to the effective joining of Ripley, Send Marsh, Send and West Clandon, thus entirely defeating the principle of the Green Belt.

6) The land comprises a large amount of formal "ancient woodland", predating the accession of Elizabeth I, 1558. As such there is a strong public interest in retaining it as such.

7) The land currently floods regularly, and is a flood zone 2 allocation. Adding tarmac and concrete will significantly exacerbate a clear existing problem.

8) The proposal for 400 homes on one site is a) excessive and b) disproportionate for Send, Ripley, Send Marsh and Burnt Common.

a) Excessive. The infrastructure in the area being utterly insufficient to cope, roads, sewage, schools and doctors' surgery all being inadequate to cope with probably 1200 additional people and 800 vehicles. No proposal is made in the plan to address this, save for the addition of a new 4 way junction on and off the A3 at Burnt Common - but that not being proposed to be built until after the houses have been built. See the observations made at A) 2) above, re Clockbarn Nursery, policy A42, which are equally applicable here.

b) Disproportionate. Send and Ripley, in the north-east corner of Guildford Borough, have 11% of it's population. Yet the Plan proposes 40% of the development for them, the majority of it accounted for by policy A43, Garlick's Arch. Yet Policy A46, land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford, which proposed 1100 homes, has been removed in its entirety, whilst Gosden Hill Farm Merrow has its number reduced from 2000 to 1700, and near the Hog's Back, Blackwell Farm's proposed homes has been reduced from 1800 to 1500. This merely emphasises how utterly disproportionate the Garlick's Arch proposals are. Many in the Send area believe it has been punished by Guildford Council for its temerity in electing two Guildford Green Belt Councillors in 2015 - a sentiment this proposal does nothing to dispel.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people, including myself
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- And finally, as to my initial point It will generate excessive traffic that will block up further the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3553  **Respondent:** 11048769 / Peter Harmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch – using existing brownfield site areas for development rather than an ancient woodland on Green Belt land would seem to be far less destructive and would avoid additional risk of flooding in an area where water drainage and flooding are already issues. Living adjacent and at an elevation just below this planned development and knowing that we are already in a flood risk area I cannot help feel this development would only cause future problems. Additionally the buffer offered by this strip of woodland between the housing in Send Marsh and the ever increasing traffic of the A3 is very important for both air quality and noise reduction.

The development of this area, necessitating the loss of an extremely valuable relief of green belt woodland, additional flooding risk and increased traffic loading local to an already difficult junction, against utilisation of existing brownfield sites does not seem necessary or progressive.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3450  **Respondent:** 11049473 / Victor Bates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4389  Respondent: 11049473 / Victor Bates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of...
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the wide development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3991  Respondent: 11049729 / Belinda Nicoll  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4  Respondent: 11053761 / Anne Rankin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? (Yes), is Sound? (Yes), is Legally Compliant? (Yes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think that the number of houses allocated to this site is ridiculous, I don't have a problem with houses being built here but the number suggested is far too high. The infrastructure in the area can not cope with that amount of additional cars/people. Where are the children going to go to school? Send CoE is already oversubscribed as is Ripley primary and then it is a whole different ball game with secondary schools - there is just not the availability of places. Also the access on and off the A3 even if you add an additional junction at Burnt Common to go North Bound, it is going to cause an already busy road to be choked every day. Yes it would relieve the amount of traffic going through Ripley but Send Barns Lane and Send Marsh Road will become a nightmare - especially as the new entrance to Send School will be in Send Barns Lane and both roads are used to cut through to Woking. And if the Wisley Airfield gets granted the whole area is just going to be inundated with cars spoiling an otherwise quiet haven between Woking and the M25. Please do not grant that many houses on this site!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6228</th>
<th>Respondent: 11053825 / Claire Owen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch. The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car. The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A Road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6028  Respondent: 11054049 / Clare Goodall  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposed development on existing green belt, its siting by the A3 will expose residents to noise and poor air quality from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6731  Respondent: 11061185 / Peter Komisarczuk  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it to be removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. No consultation took place on this, and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover Garlick’s Arch. I am appalled that we were not consulted; this is surely inappropriate behavior by GBC. There were reports in the local paper about the meeting at which this proposed Plan was so called “debated” which showed utter contempt by GBC for due process, for considered debate and the gagging of dissenters. This is not good government nor does it appear democratic.

As has been said, no doubt in thousands of objections, the site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope with the proposed development.

As previously stated your assumptions need to be looked at again in light of Brexit as well as all these aspects noted above.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/435  Respondent: 11061345 / Ewbank’s Organisation  Agent: DMH Stallard LLP (Geoff Smith)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We act on behalf of Ewbank’s, and attach our Submissions on the ‘Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites’ (June 2016) for your consideration.
Our objections relate to the omission of the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse as a development site, and propose that it be re-instated in Policy A43 for approximately 100 homes (C3), and at least 7,000 square metres of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

1. Introduction

1.1 DMH Stallard act on behalf of ‘Ewbanks’, on planning matters in relation to the Ewbank’s Burnt Common Auction Rooms site, which is located to the south of the settlement of Send Marsh/Burnt Common.

1.2 These representations relate to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2016, which covers the period 2018 to 2033.

1.3 Our representations focus on objecting to the proposed removal of the allocation of Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send, for employment and residential purposes. This allocation comprised employment uses of either (or a mix of) light industrial (use class B1(c)); general industrial (B2); and storage and distribution (B8).

1.4 This site allocation was not only in the Draft Local Plan (2014) (Site 74), but also in the Draft Version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan considered by the Guildford Borough’s Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board on 13 April 2016, and in the papers for the meeting of the Borough Council’s Executive Committee. The Report to the Executive stated:-

“Send Marsh/Burnt Common – this site is located in a yellow (medium) sensitivity land parcel. Our Employment Land Needs Assessment identifies a need for industrial land and this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need”.

1.5 We were therefore astonished that a Supplementary Information Sheet was presented to the Executive Meeting on 11 May 2016 which proposed to remove this site from the Local Plan, and replace it with a site at Garlick’s Arch, with an increased housing allocation from 100 homes to 400 homes, as well as up to 7,000 square metres of employment.

1.6 Our objections focus primarily on the reasons given in this Supplementary Information Sheet, which we submit are not drawn from any of the ‘evidence base’ documentation which has been produced throughout the preparation of the Local Plan. The proposed site allocation at Garlick’s Arch should therefore be deleted from the Local Plan, and the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse be reinstated.

1.7 Section 2 of these objections set out reasons why the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send, should be reinstated as an allocation for employment and housing. Section 3 identifies those Policies in the Proposed Submission Version of the Local Plan which should be amended, and Section 4 sets out the proposed wording of these proposed amendments.

2. Omission Site: Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send

2.1 We submit that this site, which was not only included in the Draft Local Plan in 2014, but also in the draft of the Proposed Submission Local Plan in April 2016, should be reinstated as an allocated site. We submit that the proposed inclusion of land at ‘Garlick’s Arch’ for housing and employment is ‘unsound’ as it is not based on the extensive ‘evidence-base’ for this Local Plan. We will address all of the four reasons for this proposed change, as set out in the Supplementary Information Sheet to the Council’s Executive Committee on 11 May 2016, to demonstrate that these are not ‘sound’ reasons to support the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. We will then comment on any relevant general policies on the Plan for completeness.

2.2 In the Draft Local Plan 2014 this site was “Site 74” described as being 13.4 hectares in area, with existing uses of storage and distribution (B8) and undeveloped land. It also contains the Ewbank’s Burnt Common Auction Rooms and associated car parking. It was one of the “Land Around Villages” Site Allocations, proposed for:- “Light industrial (B1(c)), general industrial (B2), storage and distribution (B8), or Light industrial (B1(c)), general industrial (B2), storage and distribution (B8) and housing (C3).” The Plan also included this site in Policy 13: Economic...
Development, as a new strategic employment site, called 'Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, Send’, and defined on the Guildford Borough Overview Map (Appendix E of the Draft Plan).

2.3 In the Draft Plan 2014, it described this site as follows: “The site contains and surrounds an existing site of three warehouses. Within the site, land to the east of the existing warehouses is suitable for new homes including at least 45% affordable houses. Land to the west of the existing warehouses is suitable for new employment uses (B1c, B2 and B8). If new homes are not provided, the whole of this site is suitable for new employment uses (B1c, B2 and B8).”

2.4 This same site was also included in the April 2016 Version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan as “Site Allocation A43 – Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send”. It proposed: “Homes (C3) (approximately 100) and employment floorspace (B1(c), B2, B8)”. In support of this proposed allocation, it states: “Key considerations:-- Location of employment uses and houses within the site.- Appropriate green buffer between residential and employment uses.” It is also contained within “Policy E1: Sustainable employment”, where it states: “When developed, the new employment site at Burnt Common will be treated as a Strategic Employment Site”.

2.5 This site was further confirmed in the Report to the Council Executive of 11 May 2016, when it stated that “this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need”).

2.6 In the light of this consistent approach to the proposed allocation of this site in the Draft Plan 2014 and in the April 2016 Version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, and the extensive evidence base supporting these versions, we were astounded to see that the site has now been deleted from the Plan, in a ‘Supplementary Information Sheet’ to the Council Executive of Wednesday 11 May 2016, and replaced with a totally new site to the east, described as ‘Garlick’s Arch’, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, without in our view any valid explanation.

2.7 The reasons given for this ‘last minute’ change are in our view unconvincing, in that they do not introduce any new evidence for allocating this site which would not have been available to the Council officers when the previous (April) revision of this Proposed Submission Local Plan was prepared. Four reasons were given in this Supplementary Information Sheet, and we comment on these in turn. Reason 1: The new site will provide land to facilitate the provision of on/off access to the A3, which will provide significant improvements to the highway network and is fully supported by Surrey County Council. This has been discussed with Highways England and further technical work will be undertaken to address their initial comments.

2.8 At no stage up to May 2016 has there been any reference to the need for the proposed employment and housing at Land around Burnt Common Warehouse to include a link onto the A3. This includes the draft Proposed Submission Local Plan published less than a month before this executive meeting. The discussions between Guildford Borough Council, Surrey County Council and Highways England must have been taking place over several months, if not longer, and at no time were Ewbank’s contacted to discuss this matter.

2.9 We are further concerned that the Council state that this proposed junction works on the A3/A247 may be required to form part of the wider transport solutions for the proposed New Settlement off the A3 on Land at the former Wisley airfield, Ockham (Site Allocation A35 for 2,000 homes approx.). In the “Transport Topic Paper – June 2016”, one of the accompanying evidence base documents for the Pre-Submission Plan, paragraph 5.52 states: “New north facing junctions to the A3 are also proposed at the A247 Burnt Common interchange. These accesses are referenced as SRN9 ‘A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road’ and SRN10 ‘A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road’ in the Appendix C Infrastructure Schedule. These junctions are being promoted to mitigate the impact of the level of strategic planned growth and in particular the development traffic flows resulting from the development of a new settlement at the former Wisley airfield site (site allocation Policy A35), as well as limiting any increase in traffic joining and leaving the A3 at the Ockham interchange.”

2.10 We submit that the previously proposed Site Allocation at Land around Burnt Common Warehouse has excellent vehicular access, and there is no reason to delete the site on highway grounds, which appears to have been the case. The Draft Plan stated that this site could be developed in the short term (1 – 5 years), and there was no reference to any transport or access constraints to its immediate development.
2.11 The site has excellent vehicular access onto the London Road (B2215) with ample capacity for the traffic which would be generated from the proposed new development on this site. This must have been recognised by the Borough Council in identifying this site for employment and housing, and there has been no change in circumstances since the publication of the Draft Plan in 2014, or the April 2016 Version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

2.12 There are also opportunities for road re-alignments directly adjacent to the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse site, which would improve both the vehicular access into the site itself, and also the overall traffic flows in the immediate vicinity of the site. We would be pleased to engage with Guildford Borough Council, Surrey County Council, and Send Parish Council to discuss these opportunities in detail. **Reason 2: The (new) site location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford (Site Allocation Policy A25).**

2.13 The proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm was also contained in the Draft Plan, and the Borough Council considered that there was a sufficient separation between the two sites at that time. There has been no change in circumstances since the Draft Plan, and so we consider that any concern relating to the separation distances between these two sites is totally without foundation.

2.14 Both at the Draft and Submission Plan stages of the Local Plan the Gosden Hill Farm site has been proposed for a mix of uses, including 2,000 homes; employment uses; education; local retail centre; community and health services; park and ride; and travellers pitches. The Submission Version (page 180) also proposes that part of the site, adjacent to the A3, will need to remain ‘open’ as a ‘green buffer’, in order to ensure that sufficient separation is maintained between the site and Send Marsh. In the Draft Submission Version (April 2016), both of these sites were being proposed for development, and there was no reference to any concern over the proximity of these two sites. There can therefore be no justification for the statement in the Supplementary Information Sheet in May 2016 that there is a need for ‘greater separation’, and to delete the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse in favour of the Garlick’s Arch site.

2.15 The Green Belt and Countryside Study, a major ‘evidence base’ document for this Plan, also confirmed that there are no concerns over the proximity of these two sites from a ‘separation of settlements’ aspect. Volume 2 (February 2013) and Volume 2 Appendix (April 2014) both identify Gosden Farm/Nuthill Farm as a Potential Development Area (Land Parcels C1 and C2), as well as Land around Burnt Common Warehouse (Land Parcel B13).

2.16 To reinforce our submission that this Green Belt Study did not express any concerns regarding the proximity of these two sites, the Environmental Capacity Analysis of the Land at Burnt Common Site (B13) (Volume 3), confirms that this site is a Potential Development Area, and is:--“Surrounded by defensible boundaries including treebelts following London Road and Clandon Road to the north and east, tree cover following the A3 to the south, and hedgerows near the commercial area to the east of the PDA.”This underlines that the Land at Burnt Common is a well screened self-contained site, and that there is no ‘evidence-base’ justification for removing this site from the Submission Plan on the grounds of needing greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford (Policy A25). **Reason 3: The Site provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs.**

2.17 The Land at Burnt Common, unlike the Garlick’s Arch site, is already an identified employment site. The Draft Plan states:--“The site contains and surrounds an existing site of three warehouses. Within the site land to the west of the existing warehouses is suitable for new employment uses (B1c, B2 and B8)”It also makes reference to the fact that the whole site has potential for new employment uses. It is also significant that the western part already contains the Ewbank’s Auction Rooms and related car parking area. This is therefore an obvious site to retain in the Plan for employment purposes, and no reason is given in the Supplementary Information Sheet for deleting this employment site.

2.18 There will also be a significant adverse impact on the residents of Burnt Common and Send Marsh if the employment allocation is at Garlick’s Arch. All the employment traffic will need to use the existing roads, including the B2215 east of the Burnt Common roundabout, and also through the villages, as there will be no direct access off the A3 from the proposed new A3 junction. No such adverse impact would result from new employment of the Land at Burnt Common, as vehicular accesses already exist from the B2215 London Road.
2.19 It is significant that in allocating the Land at Burnt Common for employment, no concerns were expressed relating to the access arrangements or traffic generation from the site. Therefore there is no reason why this proposed allocation for employment should be removed from the Plan. On the contrary, this decision will inevitably result in a significant adverse impact on the villages in Burnt Common and Send Marsh.

2.20 As has been referred to, the Land at Burnt Common is already an established employment site, with significant buildings and related car parking within the site, well screened from the wider landscape. The Garlick’s Arch site, in contrast, is a totally greenfield site, with no existing employment, and is also prominent in the landscape. It is therefore bad planning to introduce new employment development on this land, when there is an obvious alternative on Land at Burnt Common, which has significant existing employment uses; has substantial built development; and is well screened.

2.21 The Submission Plan confirms the importance of a healthy economy, and that it is essential to provide new employment land of the right type, in the right places, and at the right time. The Land at Burnt Common fulfils all of these aims, and would provide land in the short term, unlike Garlick’s Arch, which would require significant infrastructure works before the employment land would be available. The proposed new slip-road onto the A3 would not be delivered until the period 2021 and 2027, as stated in Appendix C of the Submission Plan (Infrastructure Schedule – References SRN9 and SRN10; A3 northbound and southbound off slips at A247 Clandon Road). The employment land at Garlick’s Arch will not be developed in the first 10 years of this Plan. Whereas the Land at Burnt Common could be developed immediately.

2.22 The Guildford Borough Employment Land Needs Assessment (September 2015) concludes that there could be a need of up to 47,000 square metres of office/research and development floorspace, and 5.3 hectares of industrial/storage land, and that this should be provided through the Plan period 2015 to 2033. The Land at Burnt Common would provide flexibility to provide new employment throughout this period; especially at the early stages. Garlick’s Arch, in contrast, would only be able to provide employment land from the mid 2020’s, and is therefore less able to provide the employment delivery required throughout the period of the Plan.

2.23 In selecting new employment sites in this Plan process, up until May 2016 “Land around Burnt Common Warehouse” has consistently been included. It was in the Draft Plan – Policy 13/Site 74 (2014), and in the Draft Pre-Submission Plan – Policy E1 and Site A43 (April 2016). These plans confirm that the site is suitable for employment development B1c, B2 and B8, either the whole of this site, or in part with the remainder being allocated for housing.

2.24 Even in April 2016, the Executive Report to the Council’s Executive Meeting on 11 May 2016 stated that the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse Send was the only suitable and deliverable employment site that could meet the need for a new employment site. It stated in paragraph 4.19:-“Our Employment Land Needs Assessment identifies a need for industrial Land and this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need”.

2.25 Despite this support for the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse for new employment in April 2016, no mention whatsoever is made of this site in the Council’s Employment Topic Paper June 2016, the ‘evidence base’ for employment allocations despite the consistent support for this site throughout the Plan making process. Instead, there is only a reference to Land at Garlick’s Arch for 7,000 square metres of a mix of light industrial (B1(c)), general industrial (B2), and storage and distribution (B8). We submit that this site selection is contrary to the Council’s own site selection process for new employment sites up to April 2016, and as such is a ‘flawed’ allocation, and should be deleted, and the employment allocation on Land around Burnt Common Warehouse should be re-instated. Reason 4: The site has additional capacity for residential development and can provide these homes in the early period of the plan, assisting with meeting the backlog accrued as early as possible in the plan period.

2.26 The Draft Proposed Submission Local Plan (April 2016) proposed 100 homes on Land around Burnt Common Warehouses as well as the proposed new employment. This proposed allocation was made in accordance with the significant evidence-base in site selection for Potential Development Areas in the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study.

2.27 The reason for the proposed change from allocating this site to proposing to allocate 400 new homes on Land at Garlick’s Arch, is not drawn from the ‘evidence base’, and is therefore flawed. It is not identified in the Green.
Belt and Countryside Study as a Potential Development Area when assessing the Land around Send Marsh/Burnt Common for potential development.

2.28 Our concern over this change in allocation not only relates to the lack of an “evidence base” to support the proposed allocation, but also the proposed scale of new housing in relation to the size of Send Marsh/Burnt Common. The proposed development of 400 new homes at Garlick’s Arch would be totally out of scale with the existing community, and would result in a population increase in the order of 1000 new residents. This would increase the existing population of Send Marsh and Burnt Common, which is currently 1,931 by approximately 50% (Green Belt and Countryside Study Volume 5 “Send Marsh and Burnt Common – Major Village Expansion”). This would not only be out of scale with the existing community, but would also place unacceptable pressure on existing facilities and services, such as the local primary school; nursery; and medical centre.

2.29 Serious concerns over the proposed scale of new housing which would result from the development of 400 new homes at Garlick’s Arch were strongly expressed by local residents at the ‘Local Plan Awareness Meeting’ held at the Lancaster Hall, Send on 14 June 2016. Strong objections were expressed both on the location and the scale of the proposed new housing at Garlick’s Arch.

2.30 This proposed scale of new housing at Garlick’s Arch would also cause significant traffic congestion in Send Marsh/Burnt Common. Much of the new traffic would travel north through the village to Woking, along the A247. The present A247 junction at Old Working, immediately north of the village, is already over-capacity during the rush hour, with significant "tailbacks". This would be accentuated with this additional traffic, resulting in unacceptable traffic delays.

2.31 As well as the issue of "scale", The Council’s “evidence base” also concludes that the Garlick’s Arch site is less sustainable as a housing site than Land around Burnt Common Warehouse. This is set out clearly in Volume 5 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study (April 2014).

2.32 It is important to note that the only reason that Garlick’s Arch was considered for development (in Volume 5 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study) was that at that time a policy option being considered was to identify major village expansions “Potential Major Development Areas”. This policy option has not been incorporated into the Proposed Submission Local Plan, as Table 1 of the Plan only makes reference to “village extensions”, which is consistent with the allocation of Land around Burnt Common Warehouse.

2.33 In the consideration of the sustainability of both the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse and Garlick’s Arch, the sustainability ranking for Land around Burnt Common Warehouse was higher than the Garlick’s Arch site. The higher ranking of Land around Burnt Common related to:-

- walking distance to nearest primary school
- walking distances to the nearest local centre/village shop/post office
- walking distance to nearest healthcare facility
- walking distance to nearest railway station
- average walking distance to nearest recreation facility
- walking distance to the nearest Accessible Natural and Semi-Natural Greenspace walking distance to the nearest community/village hall

2.34 As well as Garlick’s Arch not being as sustainable a site as Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, it also has significant environmental constraints. It contains three substantial areas of Ancient Woodland, including Garlick’s Arch Copse in the northern and western parts of the site, and Oldlands Copse on the eastern part of the site. Development on this site will inevitably increase the risk of these important areas of woodland being adversely affected.

2.35 Garlick’s Arch site is also prominent in the landscape. The land is currently farmland, and slopes away to the south, and as such is very exposed to long distant views and also from the A3 which borders the southern boundary of the site. In contrast, the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse is contained in the landscape, with strong natural boundaries, and is also a site which already contains significant development, including warehouses, offices, the Ewbank Auction Rooms, and related car parking and infrastructure.
2.36 The central part of the Garlick’s Arch site is also designated as a flood risk area, and totally unsuitable for built development, either housing or employment. The whole site is therefore unsuitable to allocate for housing and employment, as it has the obvious characteristics of the countryside, including agriculture, characteristics which are clearly identified in the Environmental Capacity Study (Volume 3 of the Guildford Borough Green Belt and Countryside Study – Section 10 and 11). In contrast, the development of the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse would not result in the loss of any good agricultural land, and has capacity to accommodate new development, including employment and housing, as is identified as such in the Green Belt Study.

2.37 In the light of all this evidence, we submit that no justification has been given to replace the proposed housing at Land around Burnt Common Warehouse with Land at Garlick’s Arch. There is no necessity to create new slip-lanes onto the A3, as the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse is more than capable of being developed for housing and employment using the existing road infrastructure. In contrast, the proposed new slip-lanes would inevitably and unnecessarily generate more traffic in Burnt Common/Send Marsh, as the Borough Council state that these new slip roads would be used by existing (and future) users of the Ockham interchange. This level of traffic will therefore increase significantly, due to the increased traffic generated by proposed new development along the A3 especially the proposed development at the former Wisley airfield site.

2.38 We therefore submit that the Garlick’s Arch site should be deleted, and the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse be reinstated. It is not only a more sustainable site more in scale with the existing village, but the whole site has the flexibility to either be developed for a mix of housing and employment, or alternatively to be developed for employment in its entirety. This was put forward in the Draft Version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan in April 2016, and should be reinstated in the Plan, and the Garlick’s Arch site deleted in its entirety.


Strategic Policies

3.1 We support the stated need to provide some of the housing requirement in the Borough as Village Extensions. However, any housing allocation needs to be proportionate to the size of the village. We submit that the proposal to allocate 400 new homes at Garlick’s Arch is disproportionate in scale to the existing village, and will increase the population by approximately 50%. It should therefore be deleted, and the housing allocation of 100 new homes on Land around Burnt Common Warehouse be reinstated.

3.2 We support Policy S2 which proposes between 4.7 and 5.3 hectares of industrial employment land (B1(c), B2 and B8). We submit that Land around Burnt Common Warehouse is the most suitable location for such uses, a view consistent with the Borough Council’s own view up to May 2016. We object to the proposed employment at Garlick’s Arch, and submit that the significant “evidence base” which has been published by the Borough Council does not support this proposed allocation, and is therefore “unsound”.

Protecting Policies

3.3 We support the identification of settlement boundaries for those villages that are of a scale and form that enable a boundary to be established with a degree of certainty (para 4.3.25). However, any proposed village extensions, such as at Send Marsh/Burnt Common, should be proportionate in scale with the existing village. We object to the proposed Garlick’s Arch extension of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as it is not only a site which is not supported for development on the Plan’s evidence base, but also is out of scale with the size of the existing village, and would almost double the existing population.

Employment Policies

3.4 We support the proposed requirement for additional land (B1c, B2 and B8) of between 4.7 hectares and 5.3 hectares. We further support the statement in the Policy that there is a need to ensure that there is an adequate supply of employment land over the Plan period.

3.5 We object to the deletion of Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a new Strategic Employment Site, and its replacement by land at Garlick’s Arch. The land at Garlick’s Arch is not supported by any “evidence-base” documentation. In addition, this site is dependent on the construction of the newly proposed north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common. We propose that the wording in the Draft Proposed Submission Local Plan (April 2016) in Policy E1 be reinstated to read: “When developed, the new employment site on land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send, will be treated as a Strategic Employment Site.”
would then make this plan ‘sound’, as the allocation of this site would be consistent with the Council’s “evidence-base,” and with the statement in the Executive Report to the Council’s Executive Meeting on 11 May 2016 on the Land around Burnt Common that: “this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need.”

3.6 We object to Site Allocation A43 “Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common for 400 homes (C3) and employment floorspace (B1c, B2 and B8). The reasons why this proposed allocation is not ‘sound’ is fully set out in Section 3 of this submission. It is not supported by the Council’s extensive “evidence-base”, and should therefore be deleted.

3.7 This Site Allocation should be replaced by Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send, and included as Policy A43 in the Draft Proposed Submission Version of the Local Plan April 2016. In addition, as the site has the flexibility of being able to accommodate employment uses on the whole site, the wording in the policy should be amended to read “at least 7,000 square metres of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)”.

4. Recommendations

4.1 We propose that the following changes be made to the Proposed Submission Local Plan to make it sound:-

Policy A43

Delete Land at Garlick’s Arch, and replace with the following:-

POLICY A43: Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send

Allocation

The site is allocated for approximately 100 homes (C3) and at least 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)

Requirements

- The new homes are to be provided on the eastern part of the site (east of the existing B8 use), with an appropriate green buffer between the residential use and employment uses.
- Light industrial (B1c) will be located towards the residential area, with general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) located on the western side of the site

Description

Location Village
Ward Send
Ownership Private
Area (size) 13.4 ha
Existing use Pastoral farmland and storage and distribution (B8)
LAA reference Site 152
Key considerations Location of employment uses and housing within the site Appropriate green buffer between residential and employment uses
Delete the text in this policy which states:-

“When developed, the new employment site at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, will be treated as a Strategic Employment Site”.

And replace with:-

“When developed, the new employment site on Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send, will be treated as a Strategic Employment Site”.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1747  Respondent: 11069601 / Barry Kiddell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to Policy A43.

It could never satisfy Policy S1.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7527  Respondent: 11070113 / Alison Hague  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

14. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I strongly object re Policy A43 – Land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common and Policy A43a re land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

1. I object to the late inclusion of this very large development. Does it not require full consultation under Regulation 18.
2. Where is the proof that this amount of industrial space is required, based on the ELNA 2015 and surely Slyfield is a better and already established site.
3. I ask for a re-examination of the real Housing needs and treatment of foreign students in the numbers.
4. I very strongly object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt (Policy P2)
5. I believe that all the local services will be placed under unsustainable strain.
6. The increased traffic flow will severely affect existing residents in terms of volumes, congestion, noise, emissions and change of life of a modest village. Does the standard of life of existing ratepayers not count?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council may have been influenced by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sqm of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream that runs through the site is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that could be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which is protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking would be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 would go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4453</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>11074465 / Louise Vaughan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
<td><strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
<td>()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
## POLICY A43 - Proposed development at Garlicks Arch

I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- This area is Green Belt land. Government guidelines state that this should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. An exceptional need for this huge proposed development has not been demonstrated.
- The location is completely unsuitable for a development of any size, as no transport infrastructure exists apart from the local roads, which are already up to capacity. All that would result would be gridlock from the huge number of additional cars caused by a new development, as well as the increase in danger to local children and families from the extra vehicles and resulting increase in air pollution.
- Local schools and medical services are already oversubscribed. A new development would further exacerbate the traffic problems as people are forced to travel further afield to access these and other services.
- Electrical, telecoms and sewerage infrastructure in this area are not capable of supporting a development of this size.
- The ancient wooded area that would be destroyed is important and extensive, and irreplaceable flora and fauna would be wiped out.

To summarise: a development of any scale in this location is completely inappropriate, and would serve only to produce homes that would make no contribution to the community, as it would worsen the quality of life for all concerned.

I object to this development and ask that the application be rejected.

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**

---

## I object to the Policy A43 change for the following reasons:

- No ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify this use of Green Belt land exist
- It ignores the thousands of previous objections already made by local residents
- The site is ancient woodland from the time of Queen Elizabeth 1 and cannot be replaced
- The development would effectively join up the villages of Send and Ripley, defeating the very purpose of Green Belt land
- It is currently a Zone 2 Flood area and development will make matters considerably worse
- It will generate massive amounts of additional traffic that the local road network simply cannot cope with

### What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

**Attached documents:**
We object to Policy A43 for land at Garlick’s Arch as it will increase traffic congestion on the A3 and A247, both of which are susceptible to gridlock at the slightest incident. It is also on ancient woodland, has no proven demand for development of this type.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to building 7000 square metres of industrial space and 400 houses at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road (A43).

The industrial space is not needed and should be either located at the Burnt Common site, that should be restored to its brown-field status, or to the excellent facilities at Slyfield. The housing requirements for Guildford have been grossly exaggerated and not openly disclosed. There are numerous brownfield sites that should be used for future development. Only when these sites have been exhausted should alternative sites be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

The next objections are for policy A43 and A43a,

I object to the use of Green Belt land to build 400 houses and some industrial/storage space at Garlick’s Arch. Send would cease to be a village and become a suburb of Guildford.

I object to the creation of new slip roads into the main traffic areas. This would create more chaos to areas already grid-locked at peak travel times.

No need/or surveys to support this statement ... Just try being trapped on these main roads for hours in the blazing heat orfreezing cold as already happens!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/2739  Respondent: 11097729 / Sheila Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 chan2e at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Send, because
• it ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people to the housing,
• there is no proven demand for Travelling Show-people plots in this location.
• it is part of the Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
• This could result in more traffic to cause mayhem on the local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2938  Respondent: 11098241 / Sammy Chalk  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7081  Respondent: 11098369 / Neil & Nicki Covington  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

WE OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4456</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>11098369 / Neil &amp; Nicki Covington</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4492</th>
<th>Respondent: 11098977 / Jilly Cooper</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7187  Respondent: 11100193 / Michael Turner  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. There is a danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached. I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of
people; none of them want to leave their premises. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy 11) which requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways. Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services. I object on the grounds of the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) because it will further increase traffic on the A247. The site should not be promoted as a distribution hub.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. I feel it would impact on nature in the woodland. Again the road infrastructure and increased volume of traffic would not be acceptable and the impact on local services, which are struggling to cope as it is, would be unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT to the sustainable employment policy (Policy E1)
If developed, the new employment site at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common (A43), would be treated as a Strategic Employment Site. The proposed development of up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in the scheme of industrial development relatively small. Just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m. The Garlick’s Arch site which is in the Green Belt should not be developed as a Strategic Employment Site when there is a suitable alternative brownfield site very close by, which is far more sustainable.

1. I OBJECT to the location for new employment floorspace at Garlick’s Arch – Site A43 (Policy E2)

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class B1c, B2 and B8) floorspace will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Garlick’s Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

1. I OBJECT to the loss of rural employment (Policy E5)

Policy E5 supports the retention and development of local services and community facilities in our inset and identified villages. Yet the development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises. The Plan does not promote rural employment; rather it will result in the loss of existing local rural businesses.

1. I OBJECT to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)

I OBJECT to the local plan based on the impact it will have on the special countryside of the borough.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7079 Respondent: 11150913 / Sarah Marshall Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7481  Respondent: 11151009 / Maggie Smith  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to develop land at Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43). The proposed development of industrial and commercial sites would significantly increase the volume of traffic through Send Village to and from the Waking area and beyond. Send Road already carries a high volume of traffic heading to and from the A3 and M25 which causes serious congestion at peak times in particular. The road infrastructure in the village simply could not sustain a further significant increase in traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/505  Respondent: 11151617 / Nigel Tallick  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/691  Respondent: 11159809 / Hilary Road  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Following the last consultation on the draft local plan for Send, the plan was adjusted and we were informed that there would not be further development to the plan. I trusted that this would be the case. The late amendment to the plan came as a dreadful shock. Guildford B.C. have not followed correct process. Since 2014 GBC. has changed every major site in Send proposed for development and has now added a massive new road junction. I object. I object to the proposed housing development at Garlick's Arch and I object to the proposed large industrial site, for the following reasons:

1. Potential flooding which would impact seriously on Send Marsh. I understand that this is a distinct possibility.
   1. Traffic congestion on this already very busy area. The traffic generated by a large industrial site would make life intolerable. The amount of traffic on the Portsmouth Road already makes it extremely difficult for the elderly and disabled to cross the road other than at the crossing in Ripley Village.
   1. Lack of infrastructure to support additional needs for education and medical services of the large number of new residents.
   1. Poor public transport services which obliges residents to travel by car.
   1. Garlick’s Arch is home to ancient and irreplaceable woodland.

I object to the proposed enormous housing development at Wisley. If this plan was previously rejected by Guildford Council, why is this proposal now considered viable? What has changed?

I object that there is no proposal to provide access to the A3 for the the development which would seriously impact on Ripley and Send, where traffic is busy at all times and subject to gridlock at critical times of the day.

I object at the sudden proposal to remove Ripley, Send, Clandon and other villages from the greenbelt. The open fields are the lungs of the district, in addition, they do much to ease potential flooding. A most casual glance at the surface water which spreads across the area after rainfall would alert one to the risk of flooding.

The villages provide a buffer between Guildford and Woking, and will become urbanised without the infrastructure and resources needed for support.

What is the purpose of consultation? Consultation is offered, due response is made, draft plans amended, then new and more extensive proposals are offered for consultation. This time there is a short period allowed for consideration of a weighty document which is accessible only with difficulty, by the unprofessional reader who would be affected. I object.

I further object to the disproportionate development concentrated in one area of the borough.

Please reply to this letter and ensure that it is put before the Inspector.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2419  Respondent: 11159809 / Hilary Road  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. Send Marsh.

in addition to 400 houses, for which there is no allocated increase in medical or educational provision, an additional allocation of 6 for six travelling show people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/973  Respondent: 11160001 / Andy Freebody  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3758  Respondent: 11164225 / David Avery  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist and financial back-handers to the council from the developers does not equate to “exceptional circumstances”
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7305  Respondent: 11182849 / Ian Featherstone  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposed development on existing green belt, its siting by the A3 will expose residents to noise and poor air quality from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3076</th>
<th>Respondent: 11550561 / Karen Lord</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh Policy A.43, **Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots**, I object to Policy A.43 because It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt which is to protect natural or semi natural environments, protect unique character of rural communities that might be absorbed by expanding suburbs. It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist, with beautiful bluebell woods, this ancient woodland that existed at the time of Queen Elizabeth I. It is subject to frequent flooding. I object because I do not believe there is a proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people. I especially object because of the pressure on the local infrastructure, on our village services and the excessive traffic that will gridlock the already busy roads of Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5579</th>
<th>Respondent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object – The proposal at Garlick’s Arch was a surprise additional site, included only 13 days before the Borough Council met to recommend consultation? The original site at Burnt Common was for only 100 houses, this new development would have 400 houses plus industrial facilities! I have already pointed out that the roads are congested in Send so how will they copy with even more traffic from such a large development.

The new Send Primary School I understand is already to capacity and the Villages Medical Centre currently cannot take on any more patients so where is the proposed infrastructure for these proposals?

As stated before this is Green Belt land with ancient woodland and should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3374</th>
<th>Respondent: 11941665 / Debra Hurdle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY A43 Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh**

I object – My previous objections to the building on this Green Belt site as stated in my 2016 response are still relevant. The addition of 8 Travelling Show People plots are a concern to me as surely they have very large vehicles and this site will be unsuitable for them due to poor access from the very narrow lanes, Kiln Lane and Burnt Common Lane? Would they want to be located in the middle of a housing estate with 400 houses and is there a proven demand for these plots?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1483  Respondent: 12124385 / P Davie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

b. Garlic's Arch and Burnt Common Interchange (site nos. A43 and A43a)

1. **Outside current development boundary:** I OBJECT since this development lies outside the existing housing outline of the village, and should therefore be deleted to avoid both loss of green belt land and creeping development between Send, Woking, and Guildford.

2. **Traffic Infrastructure Capacity:** I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common since this would generate significant new traffic movements that surrounding roads cannot accommodate.

3. **Traffic Infrastructure Evidence:** I further OBJECT to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common since associated transport evidence is incomplete and does not justify additional A3 access at this location.

4. **General Infrastructure:** I OBJECT to development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the development, including utilities, social amenities, schooling, public transport, and medical facilities.

5. **Industrial use:** I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is not a sustainable development. It is removed from the major population centres in Guildford and Woking necessitating a large increase in public transport services and/or major additional traffic movements for staff travel and business logistics. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space within the Borough it should be located at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available and where it would be largely welcomed.

6. **Flooding:** I OBJECT to development at Garlick’s Arch. This area is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher flood risk area than the Council’s own assessment and has flooded many times in recent years. Therefore the Council’s own assessment is invalid and the site must not be developed.

7. **Environment:** I OBJECT to the destruction of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7  Respondent: 15062081 / Chris Heath  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site was not given the consultation required.

It was added in an underhand manor and slipped in at the last minute to 'hide it' from local people and there right to comment. The borough councillor's from the Guildford Green Belt Group and Lovelace where treated in a terrible manor due to their rightful objections at the meeting held a week ago and I feel an apology should be given at the least. A full consultation under regulation 18 should be applied as it was only put in last minute, not the cheeky undemocratic regulation 19.
I will also send this to the local planning consultation/ GBC millmead and I shall be completing the questionnaire on the website.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3704  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7000sqm of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch.

This site was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan so has not had full consultation. The manor in which it has been slipped into the Plan is underhand and unfair. The site is subject to flooding and is covered by ancient woodland. The Industrial space is not needed here and any extra space required should be included in the existing industrial site of Slyfidd. The projected housing figures I understand to have been exaggerated, so there is no need for this number of houses to be built in and around Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3921  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This site was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan so has not had full consultation. The manor in which it has been slipped into the Plan is underhand and unfair. The site is subject to flooding and is covered by ancient woodland. The Industrial space is not needed here and any extra space required should be included in the existing industrial site of Slyfidd.

The projected housing figures I understand to have been exaggerated, so there is no need for this number of houses to be built in and around Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2481  Respondent: 15062145 / Philippa Hackett  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the changes in Policy A43, Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh because now in addition to the 400 homes, which now includes self build and custom plots, the proposal also includes 8 travelling/showpeople pitches where there is no proven demand for plots in this location. It is clearly over development of a village and potentially will join up Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley. At the moment these areas are distinctly separate with great space between each area but this large development will change this. Again, it is on Green Belt land which incorporates an ancient woodland, all of which will be destroy The land is subject to flooding and the new development will generate a lot more traffic which the existing local roads cannot deal with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2873  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 7000sq metres of industrial space and 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods regularly and is covered by ancient woodland, up to 500 years old, which is home to a variety of wildlife. The industrial space is not required and the additional heavy loads of commercial traffic will need to pass through Ripley village in order to gain access to the A3 and M25. There is already provision for commercial space at Slyfield industrial estate and this should be fully developed before additional sites within Green Belt locations are used. With regards to the 400 houses at Garlick’s arch, the currently existing brownfield sites within Guildford and its surrounding areas should be fully utilised before any housing is agreed within Green Field sites. Guildford has refused to share the methodology behind calculating the upcoming housing requirements and therefore no weight should be given to the use of these calculations when planning additional housing capacity.

I further OBJECT to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I further OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/301  Respondent: 15062625 / Stephen Groves  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because the site floods regularly (designated as flood zone 2) and is covered by ancient woodland, up to 500 years old, which is home to a variety of wildlife. The currently existing brownfield sites within Guildford and its surrounding areas should be fully utilised before any housing is agreed within Green Field sites. There is no proven demand for traveller sites in the location and the addition of 400 houses in a small area defies all previous objections to this proposal and is a total over-development of the village. It will essentially create a "super-village" by which Ripley and Send are amalgamated in to one and the increase in volume of traffic within the
small roads and lanes around the villages will not be able to cope. There are no proposals around the increase in additional services, such as schools, doctors, shops or road improvements for the local village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3282  
Respondent: 15062657 / Wendy Corrigan  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Where is the proven demand for plots for Travelling Show people in this location?

- Ripley and Send will be joined up - again defeating the purpose of the Green Belt, and it will generate a huge increase of traffic on the already busy local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3301  
Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the very late inclusion of the A43 Garlicks Arch site in the Plan. This is part of the Green Belt and should not be developed. It also has some ancient woodland on it which should be preserved. There is no pressing need for industrial space at this location, which, if needed at all, should be put on the Slyfield industrial estate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1101  
Respondent: 15063745 / John Pryce  
Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43, Land at Garlick's Arch.

This block of land includes ancient woodland and should remain in the Green Belt.

Another 400 homes is far too many for this site and will cause excessive traffic to the local roads.

There is no proven demand for plots for Travelling Showpeople in this area.

There are insufficient schools and facilities to cope with such a large increase in the local population.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/302  **Respondent:** 15064481 / Colin and Sue Henderson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am responding to the proposal at the above location.

I object to the above proposal on the following 3 grounds:

1) I object to Send being removed from the Green Belt. All three of the proposals including the land behind the school and adjacent woodland will affect this.

2) I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. This is a new site and was a late addition to the Regulation 18 draft. The extra traffic has not been mentioned and would be far too much for the site.

3) I object on the grounds that GBC have not followed the correct procedure. Full consultation will not be permitted under the short cut Reg. 19 which GBC are trying to implement. The" last minute" attitude to this proposal should not be permitted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/11  **Respondent:** 15064673 / Steven Yadav  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

This proposed plan was cynical pushed through last minute by the council, I strongly OBJECT to this monsterly of the plan ... building 400 homes and industrial site... there is no need... Guildford council should be shamed of proposing this plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/43  **Respondent:** 15064673 / Steven Yadav  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I strongly object to the above plan. This is so shocking in every words.

Council cynically pushed through this proposed plan at the last minute.

There is no justification to build 400 homes and some industrial space on this site.

This site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland.

This plan is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously.

Please find below my home address and I want my comments to be seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2366  Respondent: 15064673 / Steven Yadav  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/50  Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development of Garlick’s Arch in Send.

The council have not followed the correct planning process in that there have been significant changes which now require full consultation under Regulation 18.
| Comment ID: PSLPS16/51 | Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| Policy A 43 Over 400 houses would need an impact assessment on local services ie GP, hospital and schools. There is no need for industrial land at Garlick’s Arch, this should be allocated to Slyfield. Further junctions added to the A3 would created traffic chaos in Send – there is already gridlock daily at rushhour. Destruction of ancient woodland (possibly with bat population) would cause runoff down the hill to Send Marsh Road, creating a flood risk. |
| I would like my comments to be seen by the Inspector. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: pslp172/2847 | Respondent: 15067393 / Anthony Fairbairn | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43. Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show people plots I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because: |
| • It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people |
| • There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location |
| • It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist |
| • It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive |
| • It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1 |
| • It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt |
| • It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation |
| • It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years |
| • It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/13 | Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No ) |
| I strongly object to this proposal. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity as it is covered in ancient woodland dating from the 16th century. I believe there are bats in this location. There is no need for new houses on top of the |
13,860 already proposed for the borough. Building residential homes on this site is crazy. The noise from the A3 will be deafening for the residents. Homes will be very close to electricity pylons.

There will be an unacceptable increase in traffic on the already busy Portsmouth Rd. Send Rd will become gridlocked. The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is not required.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

 comment ID: PSLPS16/16  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent: 
 Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the proposal. There will not be enough school places for the children of the residents of the proposed 400+ houses. The proposal will also put an unacceptable strain on the existing GP surgery where it is difficult enough to get appointments now.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

comment ID: pslp172/2845  Respondent: 15067425 / Anita Fairbairn  Agent: 
 Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43. Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show people plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

comment ID: pslp172/3662  Respondent: 15067585 / Ann Elms  Agent: 
 Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to **Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch** because existing objections have been completely ignored and Guildford Borough Council are riding rough shod over the objections they have already received. This area is permanent Green Belt and no proposed study has been done as to why this is necessary. This area is ancient woodland going back to Tudor times and is, again, over-development of Send village. Why, oh why, is Send being penalised in this way? There has been no proper planning and seems to be a whim and a general desire to ruin and destroy the Green Belt and the village atmospheres of Send and Ripley. There will be no separate villages, just one sprawling conglomeration if this development takes place.

Again, all the roads surrounding Send and Ripley will be one big traffic jam every morning and evening and for a large part of the day.

Where is the proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location? What is the evidence for the need of Travelling Sites?

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/269  **Respondent:** 15068257 / Thomas Tuck  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I object to site A43 Garlic Arch

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/22  **Respondent:** 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43.

I object to the development of the 30 ha of land at Garlick’s Arch. This refers to a completely new site added to the local plan and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon. This land is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF that prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. In fact the site is covered in ancient woodland and there is no reason to build here as this would be in excess of the already proposed numbers for the Borough. The proposed industrial development would be better served by locating at Slyfield with other industrial units. In fact the company involved would prefer to be at Slyfield as it is more convenient for them. An increase in the junction at Burnt Common would increase substantially the traffic flow in the area, which, when there is a problem on the A3, gridlocks the local roads already. With easier access to and from the A3 this would increase the amount of traffic substantially on local roads, with M25 traffic using the A3/Send route to Woking, and include movement from any proposed housing at Wisley and Burpham if actually built.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** pslp172/168  **Respondent:** 15068737 / Angela Blaydon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

( ), **is Sound?**

( ), **is Legally Compliant?**

( )

I object to **Policy A43**, which is ignoring the thousands of previous objections as well as adding travelling showpeople plots for which there is no proven demand. This is Green Belt land and there are no exceptional circumstances existing to warrant granting permission for this development on exquisite ancient woodland dating back at least to the 16th century. This development will also erode any division between the villages of Ripley and Send and defeats the key purpose of Green Belt. This land currently has a flood zone 2 allocation and therefore unsuitable for habitation, apart from the fact that the soil is contaminated by lead shot and will generate excessive traffic onto already heavily used local roads that are also already in an appalling condition.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**


**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/24  **Respondent:** 15076513 / Ian Groden  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?**

( ), **is Sound?**

( ), **is Legally Compliant?**

( )

I object re **Policy A43 - Land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common**

and **Policy A43a re land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common**

1. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses went down in April 2016 to 185 in the face of significant local opposition to disproportionately high proposed development in Send. The method of late inclusion of a new very substantial development is of great surprise. Should this not require a full consultation under Regulation 18?
2. Is Industrial space still actually required at Burnt Common since I understand the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows an 80% reduction in employment space need from the previous ELNA. In any event, a full case has been presented for such development at Slyfield which appears a superior choice.
3. I still have doubts about real Housing need numbers and ask you to re-examine the treatment of foreign students in the numbers.
4. I strongly **object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt (Policy P2)** and also building along the Portsmouth road and the A3 on the Land at Garlick’s Arch. It may not be of marked beauty but it provides a vital role as countryside rather than town and a “breathing space” break for residents and travellers. What are the exceptional reasons for taking it out of Green Belt?
5. I believe the infrastructure of Schools, Doctors, Shops will be unable to cope- have they been consulted? In addition the, recently reduced, bus service is minimal.
6. My major concern is about the huge impact of such a development on Burnt Common Roundabout and the Send Road, A247, which already has high use and peak hour queuing. The plan talks of “quality of life and environment” but the effect of future increased noise, emissions, crowding - all factors to adversely affect existing residents who chose to live here, as opposed to future projected through traffic users - does not seem to be taken into account. Road schemes to try to maintain the same throughput rate on higher volumes does not make life nicer for local residents but is purely an efficiency exercise.
7. If increased car usage from this housing development, with increased heavy commercial traffic from the industrial site, were then added to by developments at Wisley and also Burpham also wishing to use this roundabout and route, then an ugly local environment will have been created.
8. Needless to say, a new changed interchange on the A3 would introduce substantial volumes of changed traffic movement from the M25 and A3 and destroy this pleasant village.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/27  Respondent: 15080865 / Adar Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch in Burnt Common policy A43. This proposal was added at very late notice after previously being assured by the council leader there would be no significant new changes to the DLP in Send. The use of regulation 19 further adds to the betrayal. This enormous new proposal must require a full consultation under regulation 19. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses was rightly reduced to 185 in April 2016. This late and hasty attempt to push through this plan increases the number to 485! A totally excessive and unneeded number based on inflated projections of population growth by GBC. The proposed light industrial units can easily be accommodated at Slyfield and the proposed 4 way junction to the A3 will cause traffic gridlock, noise and air pollution for local residents. All this without yet mentioning this 100 acre site is GREEN BELT (a word no longer found in the GBCs dictionary). With prime agricultural land, rare enough in Surrey, and ancient 16th century protected woodland within the boundary, this land must be saved. There is a brook running through the middle of the site essential for drainage and the area is prone to flooding already. The site prevents urban sprawl between Ripley and Send vitally important. The villages medical center already extremely busy and local schools cannot cope with the 25% population growth this plan will bring to our village. We have received emails from relevant ministers and Sir Paul Beresford stating government policy is to protect the Green Belt and listen to local residents in these matters. Why does GBC neither protect or listen to those it is elected to represent. Conservative Councillors ran for election on a protecting the Green Belt, not elected they stab us in the back.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1925  Respondent: 15080865 / Adar Sinai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy a43 Garlick's Arch;

once again, thousands of previous objections have been ignored and again there is no demand for so many houses or travelling show peoples plots at this location. This land is permanent green belt, and no exceptional circumstances exist for development. It is prime agricultural land and contains ancient woodland that has existed since Tudor times. Again, this area is prone to frequent flooding and contaminated by lead shots accumulated over 50 years. Living in Burnt Common Lane, we will be massively effected by this excessive development and planned new junction to the a3, massively increasing traffic in our area. Once again, this is green belt land that should not be built on, this will also join Send and Ripley into one continuous inhabited area, defeating the purpose of the green belt in separating our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/32  Respondent: 15081217 / Xinh Tu  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/33</th>
<th>Respondent: 15081281 / Sabine Marke-Deleau</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Policy A43 30 ha Land at Garlicks Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements and there are no exceptional circumstances and the area has ancient woodland with trees from the 16th century. Our roads could not take the traffic and would cause long delays and possible frequent gridlocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/353</th>
<th>Respondent: 15081281 / Sabine Marke-Deleau</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It will join Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/37  **Respondent:** 15081505 / Victoria Yadav  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

*Strongly object* to the above plan. This is so shocking in every words.

Council cynically pushed through this proposed plan at the last minute.

There is no justification to build 400 homes and some industrial space on this site.

This site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland.

This plan is new and was not included in the regulation 18 draft and has **NOT been consulted** upon previously.

Please find below my home address and I want my comments to be seen by the inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2355  **Respondent:** 15081505 / Victoria Yadav  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

*I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)*

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are **no exceptional circumstances** for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

*I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch*

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be **no** inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

*I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch*

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/46  Respondent: 15081729 / peter mccarthy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )

I object to these proposed changes as the current proposition is for over thirteen thousand additional houses to be built in the borough of Guildford which is considered enough to meet current projected growth in this area. In addition, this site was not included in the original regulation 18 draft and has not previously been consulted on and it is green belt permanently protected by NPPF which aims to prevent the merging of settlements. This site is covered by ancient woodland is is of particular conservation interest. Also, the proposed industrial site development of 7000 sq m is simply not required. We have a recently built small office block on the Send road has just been converted to flats. This is an indication that further industrial buildings are not required in this area. Also, Send village already acts as a through road to Woking and any further building in this area would lead to gridlock and a reduction in life quality for the residents of this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/44  Respondent: 15082049 / Antony Marke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 30 ha Land at Garlicks Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements and there are no exceptional circumstances and the area has ancient woodland with trees from the 16th century. Our roads could not take the traffic and would cause long delays and possible frequent gridlocks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/386  Respondent: 15082049 / Antony Marke  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
42.6 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

42.7 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

42.8 I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.

42.9 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

42.10 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

42.11 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

42.12 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

42.13 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

42.14 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

42.15 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

42.16 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
42.17 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

42.18 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

42.19 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

42.20 Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the proposed 13,860 homes during the plan period will stretch the police services further and is unsustainable.

4.21 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

4.22 I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

4.23 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

4.24 It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: | pslp172/2239 | Respondent: | 15084897 / Save Send Action Group (Andrew Procter) | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? | ( ) | is Sound? | ( ) | is Legally Compliant? | ( ) |

1.1 I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

1.2 It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

1.3 There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
1.4 There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

1.5 The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

1.6 This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

1.7 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

1.8 Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

1.9 The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

1.10 I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

1.11 I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

1.12 I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

1.13 I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

1.14 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
1.15 Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

1.16 Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

1.17 With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

1.18 The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

1.19 I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

1.20 Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

1.21 Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

1.22 Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

1.23 I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

1.24 I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

1.25 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

1.26 It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/54  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch in Burnt Common policy A43. This proposal was added at very late notice after previously being assured by the council leader there would be no significant new changes to the DLP in Send. The use of regulation 19 further adds to the betrayal. This enormous new proposal must require a full consultation under regulation 19. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses was rightly reduced to 185 in April 2016. This late and hasty attempt to push through this plan increases the number to 485! A totally excessive and unneeded number based on inflated projections of population growth by GBC. The proposed light industrial units can easily be accommodated at Slyfield and the proposed 4 way junction to the A3 will cause traffic gridlock, noise and air pollution for local residents. All this without yet mentioning this 100 acre site is GREEN BELT (a word no longer found in the GBCs dictionary). With prime agricultural land, rare enough in Surrey, and ancient 16th century protected woodland within the boundary, this land must be saved. There is a brook running through the middle of the site essential for drainage and the area is prone to flooding already. The site prevents urban sprawl between Ripley and Send vitally important. The villages medical centre already extremely busy and local schools cannot cope with the 25% population growth this plan will bring to our village. We have received emails from relevant ministers and Sir Paul Beresford stating government policy is to protect the Green Belt and listen to local residents in these matters. Why does GBC neither protect or listen to those it is elected to represent. Conservative councillors ran for election on a protecting the Green Belt, now elected they stab us in the back.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1618  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1193  Respondent: 15086017 / Shuli Sinai  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I have been a Send Marsh resident for over 20 years and I am writing to object to the latest change made by Guildford Borough Council concerning the draft local plan for Send, in particular the designation of the Garlick's Arch site.

This objection is on grounds that not only is this site unsuitable for a number of reasons of which I will elaborate throughout the course of this email, but that the manner in which this last minute amendment to the local plan has been executed, which I do not believe has been carried out in a fair and transparent manner; considering the time-frame, the extent of the amendment and finally the lack of consultation with residents, Parish council and the necessary regulatory bodies concerned with proposed development.

Firstly I would like to bring your attention to the application 16/P/00783 on Oldlands Field Yard, a small area of the recently earmarked site for mass development on the Garlick's Arch site, of which there is a proposal for 9, two storey dwellings that was filed almost exactly a month (12th April) prior to this latest last minute amendment to the local draft plan on 11th May. This appears to be too much of a coincidence and exemplifies the seeming lack of transparency and stealth tactics employed by Guildford Borough Council and developers in seeking approval to develop part of the site in question, which would provide a 'foot in the door development' and platform to further develop the wider site and strengthen the case for the inclusion of the Garlick's Arch site within the draft local plan. Furthermore, there is evidence to support this possibly cynical view in the possibly over-comprehensive extent of accompanying reports to the 9 dwelling development, and the transport modelling being undertaken by Surrey County Council and Highways England, which would reveal that GBC have known about the change in site designation for the local plan and benefits afforded by the initial 9 dwelling development for some time. There has however been a lack of publicity and public consultation for both these cases, and the change in site designation in the amendment comes 8 working days prior to the full council meeting - surely unacceptable in view of the above and considering the extent of the change and impact of an additional 300 dwellings on both the villages of Send and Ripley. If not mandatory, surely there is a duty of care to notify the residents of these areas affected for even the site being included provisionally, despite the 6 week allotted public consultation period after the decision reached on 24th May.

The site in question is deemed to be medium sensitivity in terms of Greenbelt yet it is being considered for mass development when there are not only low sensitivity areas available in close proximity but a list of brownfield sites - arguably in more strategic locations with regards to the industrial designation of the site, available for re-use in for example, Slyfield, as per the 'previously developed site' report also published by GBC. In the mass development study and village expansion survey it evaluates that Ripley is unsuitable - how then can a development site of this scale be promoted in the local plan that will implicate Ripley for the very reasons that deemed it unsuitable! These sites cannot be
treated in isolation, and this site at Garlick's Arch straddles both parish council zones and will have wide-ranging implications for the residents and well-being of not only Ripley and Send, but also Clandon.

I object to the housing need assessment - It is forecast that the population of the Guildford borough is actually set to plateau and decrease (and any statistics contrary to this are surely inflated by the false counting of university students who do not reside past their degree period), so surely therefore there is no need to increase the 13,860 houses already proposed for the borough by 300 in this development, and certainly no local need in Send to expand the Village by 25%.

One of the reasons for the preservation of Greenbelt is preventing Urban sprawl and preventing the merging of towns and settlements - the site at Garlick's Arch, once fully developed would represent the single largest development in the area, not only in isolation but also if coupled by the Send Marsh Road/ Linden Way housing estate positioned opposite, only separated by the Portsmouth Road.

The site is not only Greenbelt land but also has 4.6 hectares of permanently protected ancient woodland which requires Forestry commission consultation and approval for any development in close proximity to in the first instance. Has the council considered this or given any thought to the implications the removal or damage to this woodland will have on not only the UK's ancient woodland stock but to the damage to local biodiversity and habitats of wildlife?

The impact of this site on congestion and road traffic is another element which seems to have been overlooked by GBC. Whilst there is assessed benefits by GBC in the 11th May amendment of an additional junction onto the A3, surely this is short-sighted considering the resulting increased congestion on not only the A3 from this but also on the surrounding local roads of which, during traffic gridlocks, will be used by road users to avoid the A3. In addition, as identified by GBC in a congestion and traffic strategy report published in 2014, the Wisley A3/M25 interchange is already a bottleneck for traffic congestion.

At a micro scale, The Portsmouth Road adjacent to the site and in particular the junction with Send Marsh road of which this new development is within 350 yards of, already experiences a high level of congestion and traffic

If we are to further assess the potential impact of this mass development in terms of education provision, it is already well known and publicised that this area of Surrey is well oversubscribed. The increase in 400 dwellings will not just place further strain on this system but will be untenable considering that during the period 2014/15, not only the schools within catchment area of this site but within a circa 15-20 mile radius, currently experience an average ratio of 2 applicants per place for both primary and secondary education.

These are pertinent points which require careful thought in relation to the sustainability of the Guildford Borough as a place for quality of life offer in the long term, in particular the areas of Ripley and Send. Mass development proposals in unsuitable locations and on unnecessary scales such as this cannot be justified.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the planning application A43 and A43a on two main grounds.

Firstly the amount of traffic: the excess of traffic caused by these developments, on what is already an overworked junction between Sendmarsh Road and the old Portsmouth Road into Ripley, will not only cause long delays for traffic at all times but will endanger to the public trying to cross the road or be picked up on the School run coaches.

Secondly the increase on our overstretched public services in the Send area: as a member of the Send Villages Medical Centre P.P.G I know that the Surgery is now overrun with it’s current Patient base. Send local Schools just can just about cope, so how can you justify extra houses and factory outlets without providing extra facilities.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, A43

I object to this policy because

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

This is beautiful Green Belt countryside and there are no "exceptional circumstances" that should allow building on this land

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the purpose of the Green Belt

It is subject to frequent flooding

It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. Under Policy A43 you are proposing an additional 400 houses and 7,000sqm of industrial/warehousing. I object to this on the following grounds; this site is new and was not included in the Reg 18 draft so has not been consulted on previously (see 1. above), the land is Green Belt and as such is permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements, the 7,000sqm of industrial space is not required since the latest ELNA shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space since the previous draft plan and 485 new house would create additional demand on the local school which has not got the capacity to cope.

1. Under Policy A43 you are proposing a new interchange for the A3. I object to this on the grounds that this would create an unacceptable increase in volume of traffic coming onto the A247 and through Send. It would inevitably result in the junction becoming the chosen route for traffic coming from the south on the M25 wanting to access Woking and the village and roads could not cope with this increased volume.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1832  Respondent: 15099489 / Christine Vinten  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the change to Policy A43 because its ignores the thousands of objections made by local people. These changes will cause over development of the village and the number of homes is excessive. It will create a join between Ripley and Send which defeats the purpose of the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the undermining of this beautiful and permanent Green Belt area which includes woodland dating back to Tudor times. This change will generate excessive traffic blocking up the local roads of Send and Ripley. There is also no proven demand for the Travelling Show people plots proposed for this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/68  Respondent: 15099681 / David Strudwick  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regards to the development of Garlicks Arch and the destruction of open countryside to facilitate even more housing and industrial premises I object to what is clearly madness on the part of GBC.

Send and Old Woking already are subjected to ever growing levels of traffic and to develop this area along with the provision of a 4 way slip for the A3 will compound this. There is brown site land available in current industrial locations such as Slyfield to satisfy the councils desired development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/70</th>
<th>Respondent: 15099745 / Duncan Vinten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Under Policy A43 you are proposing an additional 400 houses and 7,000sqm of industrial/warehousing. I object to this on the following grounds; this site is new and was not included in the Reg 18 draft so has not been consulted on previously (see 1. above), the land is Green Belt and as such is permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements, the 7,000sqm of industrial space is not required since the latest ELNA shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space since the previous draft plan and 485 new house would create additional demand on the local school which has not got the capacity to cope.

1. Under Policy A43 you are proposing a new interchange for the A3. I object to this on the grounds that this would create an unacceptable increase in volume of traffic coming onto the A247 and through Send. It would inevitably result in the junction becoming the chosen route for traffic coming from the south on the M25 wanting to access Woking and the village and roads could not cope with this increased volume.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1681</th>
<th>Respondent: 15099745 / Duncan Vinten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43**

I object to the change to Policy A43 because its ignores the thousands of objections made by local people. These changes will cause over development of the village and the number of homes is excessive. It will create a join between Ripley and Send which defeats the purpose of the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the undermining of this beautiful and permanent Green Belt area which includes woodland dating back to Tudor times. This change will generate excessive traffic blocking up the local roads of Send and Ripley. There is also no proven demand for the Travelling Show people plots proposed for this location.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

| Attached documents: |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/82</th>
<th>Respondent: 15101793 / Julia Goddard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td><strong>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object to the 2016 Draft for Building Houses in Garlicks Arch Ripley mainly as I live around that area and it will have a negative impact on traffic going through and getting held up on Burnt Common Lane.

I like to walk my dogs around there. It is lovely to have our green belt and the wildlife needs to feel safe and able to remain there.

I Object to all Erosion of the green belt which would include Clandon building of houses and Send and Burpham, Ripley, Wisley. The negative effect it will have on car pollution and green peace and devastating traffic chaos across the region.

I object to the removal of any villages such as Send, Clandon, Ripley, Wisley. These are my key areas which I feel strongly about and adore the walks around the countryside with my two dogs.

I object to the limited consultation Period of all of this going ahead

I object to the houses being built in Send, Wisley, Ripley, Burpham, Clandon with no or little evidence for the alleged housing need numbers.

I object to the lack of immediate provision for new schools. if we remain the same then there will not be a huge demand on NHS or Schooling needs.

I object to the lack of any immediate provision for doctors surgeries in Send or Ripley area.

I object to Garlicks Arch and the new roundabout system that will be developed to handle all the traffic, the Ripley Bypass already struggles when the M25 gets blocked, so this would be ridiculous and not work.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/83  Respondent: 15101793 / Julia Goddard  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Object to the 2016 draft for building houses in Wisley, Clandon and Send.

I live just across from Garlicks arch and I go to London from Clandon Station

At this minute in time these areas cant hold so much traffic and it is not sustainable to allow all the opposed housing to go ahead.

The Ramp for the A3 will have dramatic implications.

I object to the Erosion of all Green belt in the areas of Garlick Arch, Wisley, Clandon, and Send

I object to Limited Consultation Period

My daughter will be going to Clandon School and I object to the number of houses being built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/359  Respondent: 15102049 / Malcolm Holland  Agent:
I object to Policy A43 because
1. ignores previous objections
2. it is permanent green belt
3. total over development of already developed village
4. ancient woodland that should be persevered
5. joins two villages and defeats green belt purpose
6. more flooding
7. contaminated with lead shot
8. extra traffic for which local road not built for

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/86  Respondent: 15102209 / Martin Manktelow  Agent: 

Policy A43 This particular site is set partly on farmed land and part in ancient woodland which is used for many country pursuits such as shooting, clay pigeon shooting and dog walking.

The land abuts the East Clandon Stream which floods most winters. The land is bordered on one side by the A3 and this very busy road would not make a good neighbour. The proposal is to place 400 houses on one part of the land and a range of industrial buildings to be placed on the rest. Furthermore, with so many buildings being added the run off the land onto the stream will be aggravated. I understand that the site is built on London Clay. This means that every time there is the potential for the stream to raise, the land floods. In addition the trees that are being removed will also exacerbate the problem. The copse is home to and regular visiting place for deer, foxes, owls, bats rabbits, hares not to mention a carpet of bluebells in spring

The wooded part of this land contains ancient oaks. Many of these oaks are hundreds of years old. The land is bordered on other sides by Klhn Lane and Burnt Common Lane, both are narrow residential lanes and totally unsuitable for large amounts of traffic. Both lanes exit onto the B2215 Portsmouth Road. This road is a feeder road to the A3 and M25 which is heavily congested both night and morning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/1389  Respondent: 15102497 / Alison Parrott  Agent: 
I object to the above as the number of homes is excessive and will cause over development of the village, doing away with the space between Ripley and Send. There is no demand for traveller sites here and will tear up beautiful and ancient woodland, which cannot be replaced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/92  Respondent: 15103873 / Paul Johnston  Agent:

I am emailing you to say that I strongly object to Policy A43 and A43a.

As a resident in Burntcommon I feel that these would be disastrous to the local area. In addition to destroying a beautiful green belt area it would bring significantly increased traffic volumes to an already stretched local road network.

In my view Policy A43a is absolute insanity and would significantly impact the traffic volume past my house and through the village of Send to an untenable level. If a traffic assessment report has been completed showing the predicted impact on the local road network I would be grateful if you could send it to me.

Please ensure that my comments are seen by the Planning Inspector

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/104  Respondent: 15106593 / Louise Clark  Agent:

I am writing to object to the proposed planning at Garlicks Arch for the building of houses. This is an unspoilt wildlife area with horses, deer, rabbits etc, streams and an allotment area.

It would create an enormous amount of traffic, therefore blocking roads and transforming this peaceful village. Please do not let this go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6567  Respondent: 15106593 / Louise Clark  Agent:
I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. The site is ancient woodland with many wild animals, including bats, deer, red kites, badgers, pheasants. The site would not make a clean environment for residents with ever-growing pollution from the already over-used A3. It is covered by electrical pylons and cables.

The A3 is already choked most of the day with traffic approaching the M25 and in the evening around the A3 Guildford bypass. The local infrastructure cannot support this and there are other areas that would suit development better with a totally new junction onto the M25 required.

Industrial space should be extended at Slyfield which is already deemed INDUSTRIAL! Brownfield sites should be better utilised.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/105  Respondent: 15106785 / Giles Puckle  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the site at Garlick's Arch being developed on the grounds that this development is simply unsustainable. Living opposite the proposed site I am aware of the lack of local bus services, the lack of a railway station within a thirty minute walk and the lack of local infrastructure in terms of schools, doctors surgeries and shops. The proposed development of an additional 400 houses here will severely impact the lives of us local residents.

- Local police services, which are already seeing funding reduced are stretched now, so I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch and Wisley Airfield as it will stretch these resources even further.

I hope that common sense prevails and that all of the objections of local residents who care deeply about our community are listened to.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/106  Respondent: 15106881 / Sarai Sinai  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We are writing to object to the proposed development at Garlicks Arch in Burnt Common policy A43. This proposal was added at very late notice after previously being assured by the council leader there would be no significant new changes to the DLP in Send. The use of regulation 19 further adds to the betrayal. This enormous new proposal must require a full consultation under regulation 19. The 2014 proposal for 430 houses was rightly reduced to 185 in April 2016. This late and hasty attempt to push through this plan increases the number to 485! A totally excessive and unneeded number based on
inflated projections of population growth by GBC. The proposed light industrial units can easily be accommodated at Slyfield and the proposed 4 way junction to the A3 will cause traffic gridlock, noise and air pollution for local residents. All this without yet mentioning this 100 acre site is GREEN BELT (a word no longer found in the GBCs dictionary). With prime agricultural land, rare enough in Surrey, and ancient 16th century protected woodland within the boundary, this land must be saved. There is a brook running through the middle of the site essential for drainage and the area is prone to flooding already. The site prevents urban sprawl between Ripley and Send vitally important. The villages medical centre already extremely busy and local schools cannot cope with the 25% population growth this plan will bring to our village. We have received emails from relevant ministers and Sir Paul Beresford stating government policy is to protect the Green Belt and listen to local residents in these matters. Why does GBC neither protect or listen to those it is elected to represent. Conservative councillors ran for election on a protecting the Green Belt, now elected they stab us in the back.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2513</th>
<th>Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch to allow for 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. This proposal will over-develop our village as this number of houses is unduly excessive and will erode the ancient woodland that has existed for hundreds of years. Guildford Borough Council should be protecting this area not developing it. It will join up Ripley and Send villages and will erode the Green Belt further and generate excessive traffic and block the already gridlocked roads. The area is prone to flooding and this proposal will increase the likelihood of further flood damage. There is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area, and ‘no exceptional circumstances’ exist to destroy the Green Belt status of this location. There are others areas in the Borough available for development. This area is already full to capacity, the Doctors Surgery and schools are struggling to cope with existing volumes as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3845</th>
<th>Respondent: 15106977 / Y C Smithers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch to allow for 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. This proposal will saturate our village as this number of houses is unduly excessive and will destroy the ancient woodland that has existed for hundreds of years. Guildford Borough Council should be protecting this area not developing it. It will join up Ripley and Send villages unnecessarily and will erode the Green Belt further and generate excessive traffic, blocking the already gridlocked roads. The area is prone to flooding and this proposal will increase the likelihood of further flooding. There is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area, and ‘no exceptional circumstances’ exist to
destroy the Green Belt status of this location. There are others areas in the Borough available for development. This area is already bursting at the seams, the Doctors Surgery and schools are struggling to cope with existing volumes as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/212  Respondent: 15107041 / Andy Williams  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Once again I am compelled to write to you to raise objections regarding the local plan. I find it exasperating that I continuously have to raise objections to a local plan which demonstrates an absolute failure of a proper planning process. You have not made any attempt to mitigate and or amend the plan despite the significant volume of objections to the 2016 plan. Indeed Guildford Borough Council has made the situation even worse by combining proposals around Garlick’s Arch and Burnt common and not altering the proposals based on previous objections.

I object to the proposals to build 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots on the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43, for the following reasons:

• Thousands of objections have been raised on this previously, this is in complete disregard to all previous objections
• There is no evidence of a demand to house travelling show people in this location,[Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]
• The land is in the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist
• The number of homes is excessive ensuring complete over development of the village. There would be no definition of villages between Ripley & Send defeating the purpose of the Green Belt
• Infrastructure cannot support this. Traffic and pollution levels are already a major problem, schools and medical facilities, as required by law, are already over stretched
• The land is an ancient woodland that existed back in the reign of Elizabeth 1
• The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation, drainage remains substandard
• Due to local shooting facilities, the land is contaminated by lead shot

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5976  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick’s Arch, because it is not justified by special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded.
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslt172/513  Respondent: 15107777 / Paul Ayers  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 (Garlick’s arch, now 400 homes and 6 traveller plots) changes because:

The land is beautiful, ancient woodland and in a permanent Green Belt area.

There is not a demand for 400 houses in Send, the demand is nearer to Guildford

This plan over allocates housing in Send as opposed to other villages

I object to taking land out of the Green Belt, whose purpose is to protect villages, and prevent urban sprawl

Our village of Send is a small rural village which cannot support 400 extra homes: the infrastructure is inadequate, especially roads which are frequently jammed with traffic

It is often flooded and is currently flood zone 2

There is no demand for Travelling Show people plots here

You have ignored all our previous objections

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/111  Respondent: 15107841 / Alex Batlin  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection i.e. I object - to the Guildford local plan 2016 involving Garlicks Arch. Thanks
Here are my reasons

1. **Not protecting the Green Belt**
   I object to the proposals to remove Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Greenbelt. There are no special circumstances to do this. Once taken the green belt is lost forever.

2. **Disproportionate size of sites in relation to rural locations**
   I object to the allocation of land to the strategic sites of Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border) and Gosden Hill (Clandon). The proposed development of these sites will have a disproportionate impact on the surrounding local villages. They will have a permanent impact on each of these communities.

3. **Unbalanced allocation of development in one area of the Borough**
   Between the M25 and Burpham, a distance of only about 5 miles it is proposed that over 6,500 houses are built. This represents over 40% of the housing proposed in the Local Plan. I object to this area being hit so hard by the allocation of development, which is disproportionate to the rest of the Borough.

4. **Congestion on the trunk roads, A3/M25**
   I object to the development of the strategic sites due to A3 and M25 already being at capacity during peak hours. Highways England has no plans to look at improving the A3 before 2020. It is therefore not sustainable to identify sites for further development which will worsen the congestion on these motorways and trunk roads.

5. **Congestion on the local village roads and lanes**
   Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. I object to further development which will cause greater congestion in and around our villages.

6. **Unsuitability of our local roads for heavy vehicles and more traffic**
   Many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

7. **Poor air quality concerns**
   Further congestion, particularly in built up residential areas will only lead to greater levels of air pollution. I object to further development, which will result a fall in the air quality.

8. **Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites**
   I object to the lack of planning and implementation of infrastructure. For example at Garlick’s Arch. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ quality of life will significantly deteriorate in many ways. How will the local services such as doctors and schools cope?

9. **Lack of Utilities Capacity**
   Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch on the ground that there is little capacity in these networks.

10. **Sites being planned in unsustainable locations**
    Many of the strategic sites e.g. Wisley Airfield and Garlick’s Arch, are in unsustainable locations. They do not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. I object on the grounds that these sites are not sustainable.

11. **Parking issues in local villages caused by larger population**
    Many of the affected villages, such as Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems. To which I object.

12. **Local healthcare facilities will be overwhelmed**
    Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. I object due to the further stress it will put upon existing health services.

13. **Local policing facilities will be overwhelmed**
    Police services are seeing funding reduced. The development of the likes of Garlick’s Arch and Wisley Airfield will stretch the police services further and I object.

14. **Local social welfare facilities will be overwhelmed**

15. **Local shops/restaurant facilities will be overwhelmed**

16. **No protection of heritage assets**
17. No protection of the environment
18. Overdevelopment of sites
19. Not meeting the needs of local communities
20. Insufficient affordable housing
21. Poor quality of layout and housing design
22. Insufficient consideration of SPA, SSI and Conservation Area issues
23. Lack of proper cycle lanes on local roads
24. Lack of proper pedestrian footpaths on local roads
25. Current SHMA figure of 693 p.a. too high

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/114  Respondent: 15109121 / Larry Bottomley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

So specifically:

Policy A43 30 ha land at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common.

Building at Garlick’s Arch means that on and off access to the A3 at the Burnt Common roundabout will be required but will also have a significant impact on the already congested local roads. We have massive lorries coming through Clandon, Send has a significant congestion problem at rush hour through to Old Woking and better access at Burnt Common to the A3/M25 will have a very damaging impact on both villages.

The road passing through Send is very congested for long periods during the day and this would only exacerbate the problem. The addition of 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch with no local offices or other places of work, increases those that need to drive to work. The addition of Industrial units will likely mean more large lorries on the narrow and already congested roads.

400 houses will increase pressure on Send First and St Bede’s (already full) and the Villages Medical Centre (where currently getting a timely appointment is challenging).

Without consideration of these resources or an integrated transport plan, I object to Policy A43.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/117  Respondent: 15109601 / Louise Majithia  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the suggestion of new houses at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt common does not need new houses. The site has not been consulted on properly and is a conservation area. The implications of the extra traffic will grid lock send. The infrastructure cannot cope.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/137  Respondent: 15109985 / Shane Sayed  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regard to the proposal for 400 homes on green belt land at Garlick's Arch near Burnt Common I have the following objections:

(1) The area proposed for housing development is Green Belt land and I strongly object to this area of woodland being lost forever and turned into a housing estate. My family regularly use this area for recreation purposes and do not want to lose this area of natural beauty.

(2) I object to the Wisley Airfield, Garlicks Arch (Ripley/Send border) and Gosden Hill (Clandon) sites being used for housing development as the nearby villages do not have the infrastructure to support the increase in traffic, population. I also object to the disproportionate amount of housing being proposed for these areas as the level of congestion will rise to an unacceptable level in the surrounding roads, lanes and major thoroughfares.

(3) There is already a very high level of traffic congestion in Ripley high St as well as the junction off the A3 into Send village and I object to the increase in traffic that would materialise as a result of the proposed development. I also object to the vast increase in traffic that would arise on the junction between the M25 and A3.

(4) I object to the additional strain that the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have as a result of the large increase in population in the area. This service is already overstretched and the development will exacerbate the problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6156  Respondent: 15109985 / Shane Sayed  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Regarding the proposal for 400 homes on green belt land at Garlick's Arch near Burnt Common I have the following objections:

(1) This area is Green Belt land and I strongly object to losing this area of woodland which my young family uses on a very regular basis.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/146  Respondent: 15110177 / GORDON TURNER  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Policy A43, 30 ha Land at Garlicks Arch. There is no need for anymore houses on top of the already proposed 13860 houses in the plan. An industrial centre there is a complete joke how will Send A247 deal with the increased HGV traffic? I do await you thoughts on this as I live on Send Barns Lane and are probable in a better place to judge the impact it would have than people at GBC unless you wish to come and stay at my address for some days to get first hand experience.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I live in Rose Lane in Ripley and I am very concerned to hear the proposal of building new homes on the site of Garlick Arch. There are many reasons as to why I object to this, preserving the green belt is vital in the survival of woodland that has existed for decades and the destruction of this will not only make the area an eye sore but the destruction of wildlife habit I strongly object to.

Secondly the road leading to and from Ripley is already congested and any additional traffic will add to this congestion which will make life unbearable for the local residents who like me have lived a village lifestyle for a number of years and I object to the added noise pollution, general congestion, air pollution and parking issues, traffic jams this will create before, during and after the homes are built.

The facilities in Ripley itself will not be able to cope with the parking situations that will increase to an already overcrowded situation to which I also very strongly object too.

The only parking facilities in Ripley are the ones in White Hart Meadows and this is overcrowded each and everyday posing major issues for the residents and this will only increase as there are very few local shops which won't cope with the demand hence I object to the housing on Garlick Arch as the area would not cope with the demands.

I believe that Ripley is a village not a new mini town and well not be able to cope with the burden of extra traffic, people and congestion and pollution. It is an area a beauty and this atmosphere will be destroyed if new homes are built in and around the surrounding areas of Garlick Arch. I, strongly object to the proposal and the green belt must and should survive for the reasons I have stated above and for a wide variety more and the proposal should be dismissed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A43 at Garlicks Arch as: -
1. The addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots – is there really a requirement in the local area?
2. Thousands of objections to proposals and the volume of housing have been made and ignore with the same number of houses being included, of which the infrastructure is not in place and will cause huge safety issues in an area where there are already several near-misses with the junction of Burnt Common Close. It will cause over development of the area and the village.
3. There are no exceptional circumstances for building on this Green Belt land, more so on the ancient woodland
4. Increased risk of flood (currently a flood zone 2 allocation)
5. The land is contaminated by lead shot

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/738  Respondent: 15114145 / Barry Roads  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

I object to the above Policy change at Garlick’s Arch which is now 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots.

Why do the previous thousands of objections appear to be ignored by the Council?.

This land is green belt – the Government itself states the following:-

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another – Send and Ripley will become one if these homes are allowed to be built.
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

So as there are no exceptional circumstances why are these being ignored in respect of Garlick’s Arch that has been around for hundreds of years.

I have lived in Send Marsh for 21 years and in all that time there has never been a proven demand for Travelling show people spaces.

Already at peak times it is very difficult to get out of Send Marsh Road onto the old A3 and these homes will only generate additional traffic – additionally if there is a problem on the main A3 all the traffic filters down through the old A3.

I do not believe that sufficient thought has been given to the infrastructure of the whole area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2301  Respondent: 15114721 / Leslie Macnair  Agent:
I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A43 Change Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh because:

- It is a huge over-development of the village
- It will generate large amounts of traffic onto the roads leading to Ripley, Send and the A.247 to Woking.
- There are no exceptional circumstances that justify the size and increase in this policy
- It will make a ribbon development between Send and Ripley
- The proposed increase ignores all previous objections made by local people for the placing of all these houses on Green Belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I am writing to express my very strong objection to the draft proposal for Garlicks Arch in Send Marsh.
As a resident of the Send Marsh area I object to these proposed plans as I feel strongly that the proposed plans are completely disproportional to the size of the Send and Ripley village area and will irreparably damage the character of this small village community.

In addition, this small village does not have the facilities or infrastructure to support such a vast increase in the population. The area is already unable to cope with the traffic in peak travel times and additional housing will create even more pressure on our struggling roads. The roads through Send, Ripley and Clandon are very narrow and bendy and already struggle during rush hour. Parking is a very big concern in the area already with many cars parked out in the road making it difficult for cars to move through the area and for cyclists to use the roads safely. The area is poorly served for public transport, the nearest train station is 50 minute walk and buses are expensive and only operate twice an hour (if you are lucky!).

The local area is not equipped to support an increase in demand for local services such as schools and the doctor's surgery. It is already challenging to obtain an appointment with my GP.

I have lived in this area all of my life and gratefully enjoy the small community atmosphere of this area. The proposed plans are excessive and completely disproportionate for this rural community and the damage caused by this proposed plan will irreparably damage the area and its natural beauty. The area proposed for development is an area I regularly walk around and it would be gutting to think this area will no longer be the same.

I hope you take my objection into consideration and I would appreciate receipt of my email so that I know my views have been carefully considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/166  Respondent: 15129185 / Fraser Paterson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed plans for the development of Garlick's Arch and to the proposal to remove Send from the Greenbelt.

I object to the development of Garlick's Arch on the basis that I understand these houses are in addition to the number of houses already proposed for the borough and that they are an unnecessary destruction of Greenbelt land. Also, should this development go ahead there is no infrastructure, Roads, Transport facilities, Medical facilities, Schools etc, to support the additional population these houses would bring. With regard to the Industrial Development there appears to be no justification whatsoever for this as I understand that this replaces the industrial development planned for Slyfield which is obviously a much better site for such development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1961  Respondent: 15129281 / C Nicholson-Ross  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to your plans to increase the development in the Garlick's Arch area particularly as you have shown nowhere in
the plan why you feel this development is necessary. The area falls within Green Belt land and, as such, you need to show
exceptional need before allowing development to happen. If your proposals are allowed to go ahead it will mean that
Clandon, Ripley and Send simply merge together into one expanse of buildings.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1966  Respondent: 15129281 / C Nicholson-Ross  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to your loading this North East corner of your Borough with an unfair amount of development whilst removing
planned development from other areas.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1064  Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 , the change at Garlick's Arch. It ignores all the previous objections, there is no proven demand for
travelling showmen's plots in the location.

It is in an area of outstanding historical beauty being in ancient woodlands some 600 year old.

I object most strongly too to the fact it will link Ripley and Send and destroy the green belt between the villages.

Another example of lack of consideration for the openness of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1066  Respondent: 15131425 / Roger Mutton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 , the change at Garlick's Arch. It ignores all the previous objections, there is no proven demand for
travelling showmen's plots in the location. It is in an area of outstanding historical beauty being in ancient woodlands
some 600 year old. I object most strongly too to the fact it will link Ripley and Send and destroy the green belt between
the villages. Another example of lack of consideration for the openness of the Green Belt.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/172  **Respondent:** 15131681 / Norman Lavender  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the fact that Guildford Borough Council has not provided evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015. Also the infrastructure in the village of Send just does not exist to support any of this proposed development.  
I object to Send being removed from the green belt. I accept the need for new housing but there is no reason these should be built on green belt land when there are so many brownfield sites available.  
I object to the fact that the "final draft" of the Local Plan which has been prepared without the requisite full consultation under Regulation 18. This has changed vastly from the one originally proposed (and objected to) in 2014, increasing the number of proposed houses from 430 to 485, and adding a new road junction which was not mentioned in the earlier Plan.  
I object to the proposed new homes on the land west of Winds Ridge and Send Hill. Again, this was not included previously. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.  
I object to the proposal for 400 houses and 7000 sqm of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch, and a new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common. This would cause major problems due to the increase in the amount of traffic coming through the village of Send.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4443  **Respondent:** 15132769 / Nicky Andrews  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposed developments in The Guildford local plan 2016. I object to green belt land been taken to be used for housing and industrial use. Particularly at Garlick's Arch where there is ancient woodland at risk. I object to the huge impact that the Guildford local plan 2016 would have on the environment.  

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?  

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/180  **Respondent:** 15136481 / Roy Padgett  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

b. I object to the proposals relating to site A43 at Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1007  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017) and in particular to the changes that affect Ripley and Send, which appear to make the Plan even worse than those proposed in 2016.

Please record my objections as follows:

1. I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1008  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Show-people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Show-people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Show-people plots in A43 Garlick’s Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1017  Respondent: 15136513 / Ian Mitchell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4342</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15136641 / Jason Dack</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/138</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15136641 / Jason Dack</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

This is a response to the updated Local Plan. I would like to strongly object to the new proposals which are even worse than before.

1. Over 40% of all the proposed development is now in the North East of the Borough which is too much for this small rural area. This will destroy the substantial parts of the precious Green Belt and will be extremely disruptive for residents. Furthermore, it will apply unsustainable pressure on roads, schools and GP surgeries.

2. Developments at Site A43 Garlick’s Arch will destroy substantial parts of the countryside. No need has been identified for this development. It is absolutely vital that the Green Belt is preserved – once it has gone, it will be gone forever. It will also encourage more building on green space throughout the country. Future generations will suffer for this loss.

3. Six additional Traveller plots have been added to the proposals for Garlick's Arch (Section 4.2.22 of the plan). This is unbalanced and unfair. These plots and accompanying storage facilities are completely unsuitable for the rural area. Why do 75% of these plots have to be in Ripley?

4. The possibility of an additional 400 houses at the Site A43 Garlick's Arch is extremely damaging for villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will lead to a further increase of the local population, bringing even more traffic to the area which means even poorer air quality and congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/192</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15136929 / Richard Davis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy A43, 30 ha of land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.

I object because:

- the site was not included in the regulation 18 draft and the site has not been consulted on previously;
- it is currently Green Belt and building on the site will undermine Send’s village status;
- a new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would make Send a through route for traffic leaving the A3 and M25 for Woking, overloading the road through Send village;
- proposed improvements to the A247 through Send would not alleviate the congestion situation because the bottleneck is at the Old Woking roundabout – there is simply no road capacity leading to the A247 from Woking to allow traffic to flow – there are already long queues and delays during peak times;
- the need for additional industrial development has not been demonstrated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
| Comment ID: PSLPS16/7295   | Respondent: 15138433 / Sylvia Pyne   | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| Of particular concern to me and my family is that a more local level the proposals include: 400 houses at Burnt Common (3.2 miles away). |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: pslp172/946   | Respondent: 15138849 / Anne Walters   | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object to Policy A43, 'The Garlick's Arch development. The 400 houses proposed would increase the existing population disproportionately to the existing population, and overwhelm the Villages Medical Centre and local schools. St. Bede's School, Send is being rebuilt on the basis of existing pupil numbers, and the proposed expansion of population would very quickly make it inadequate. New housing developments attract predominantly young families with school age children. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/211   | Respondent: 15140065 / Daron Jones   | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because the number of homes is excessive and the addition of 8 travelling/show people pitches is unnecessary. Send Marsh is currently a flood zone and the addition of these houses is very worrying. It will generate much more traffic which at peak times blocks traffic in Send and Ripley. I object strongly to any more intrusion on the Green Belt in this beautiful area. |
| I object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because there is no need to build warehouses in the middle of the Green Belt when there are many empty sites for this purpose at Slyfield and Guildford. This would also create more traffic on already congested roads. |
| I object to any more. |
| What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? |
| Attached documents: |
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Just emailing my protest at all the houses you want to build in send marsh and the surrounding areas, not only is this area already over populated and trying to get from home to work in rush hour is manic as it is, and you want to add more congestion and add the the problems, it's crazy! We also have a hard enough time trying to get an appointment at the doctors surgery so adding more people to this area will be making matters worse than what they already are, same goes with the schools, this is an increasing problem, I'm sure I do not need to say any more, we pay a premium to live in a village and what you are proposing to do is going to turn our lovely villages into a town, and myself like many others bought our houses away from the hustle and bustle of busy towns, I see this is not a government proposal and only a Guildford borough council one, I strongly disagree with what you are wanting to do, it would make many people viewing your plans very angry and see GBC as being greedy and just thinking of the profits many more houses would bring in. This is a protest from my household not only myself and that's 5 people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/212  Respondent: 15140225 / Stephen Reed  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

re the GBC plan to build over 14,000 new homes under the revised draft local plan such as Garlicks' Arch, Wisley and Gosden Hill.

It is bad enough getting out of Send Marsh Road onto Portsmouth Road in rush hour times and this area CANNOT cope with additional housing and traffic. Soon there will be a fatal collision as the roads cannot cope with this extra traffic.

The extra road traffic will also affect the M25 around junction 10 and the A3 south bound to Guildford. Both of which can be very congested. It's not just the amount of vehicles, but the extra noise and air pollution they will emit.

We purchased Bramble way in Send Marsh specifically because it was in a green belt environment. We do not want this green belt taking away and becoming a suburb of Guildford/Woking which it will become with no green space in between and a mass of housing and traffic.

Therefore I want to formally confirm that:

I OBJECT TO any/all erosion of the green belt
I OBJECT to any 'in-setting' of any villages from the green belt
I OBJECT to the planned development in one area of the borough which cannot sustain this
I OBJECT TO the limited consultation period and last minute inclusion of new sits with less than 2 weeks notice - THIS IS UNACCEPTABLE
I OBJECT to the lack of provision for new schools and doctors which are already under strain with the population increase
I object to the lack of any evidence for the alleged housing numbers.

We do not wish to live in a large town hence we moved to a village in the green belt.

There are sufficient brown sites available and Woking and Guildford are already inundated with tower blocks of new flats.

We strongly object to the way Guildford B.Council is attempting to reduce green belt and built houses and incur congestion where it is not appropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/213  **Respondent:** 15140417 / Jeff Greenwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) I object to all erosion of the Green Belt

2) I object to the site A43 Garlicks Arch

3) I object to the A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them!

4) I object to the site A45 The Talbot - This is over development in a conservation area

5) I object to the A57 The Paddocks - this is unlawful

6) I object to any "in-setting" (ie removal) of any villages from the Green Belt

7) I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough

8) I object to the limited consultation period

9) I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice

10) I object to the lack of evidence for the alleged housing numbers needed

11) I object to the lack of provision for new schools

12) I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4449  **Respondent:** 15140417 / Jeff Greenwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/217  Respondent: 15140641 / Sandra Greenwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1) I object to all erosion of the Green Belt
2) I object to the site A43 Garlicks Arch
3) I object to the A43a the on and off ramp at Clandon - this will increase traffic problems in the villages, not help them!
4) I object to the site A45 The Talbot - This is over development in a conservation area
5) I object to the A57 The Paddocks - this is unlawful
6) I object to any "in-setting" (ie removal) of any villages from the Green Belt
7) I object to the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough
8) I object to the limited consultation period
9) I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice
10) I object to the lack of evidence for the alleged housing numbers needed
11) I object to the lack of provision for new schools
12) I object to the lack of any immediate provision for Doctors Surgeries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4462  Respondent: 15140641 / Sandra Greenwood  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/229  Respondent: 15141953 / R Pomphrey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43 Garlick's Farm

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3428  Respondent: 15142977 / Paulina Adair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 proposing to build 400 homes and 6 travelling show -people plots at Garlick’s Arch. There is no evidence that the travelling show-people plots in this area are needed. And is there solid evidence that 400 new houses are needed in this area? I have read different articles in the press suggesting that the estimates for the new housing in the area are overestimated especially now when Britain is entering the Brexit negotiations.

Have the planners considered the fact that this land is subject to frequent flooding and it currently a flood zone 2 allocation? Also, I thought that only in the “exceptional circumstances” the permanent Green Belt area can be built on. What constitutes “exceptional circumstances” in this case?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/239  Respondent: 15143297 / Ronald Mounsey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A43 Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/243  Respondent: 15143393 / Susan Mounsey  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to site A43 Garlicks Arch.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/247  Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing as a very concerned resident of Send, to object to the proposed developments at Garlick's Arch, Burnt common and land on Winds Ridge Send Hill.

I strongly object to the removal of Send from the Green Belt, something that I thought the government had put on their manifesto to protect. As this is mainly a Conservative council I thought this is something that you would be looking to uphold. It seems I, like many other voters have been misled!

The Green Belt was established to limit this type of over development, and to remove it would merge Woking into Guildford. Once a field has been built upon it will never return to its original state, it will be lost forever!

I work as a Driving Instructor and use the roads daily. In the last five years my job has become increasingly difficult, just trying to get between pupils and to teach them safely. On average the A246 which runs through our village is completely blocked both morning and night at least twice a week. This can be due to a road repair in old Woking, a broken down lorry or more regularly now, a crash on either the A3 or M25 leading to vehicles exiting these roads in favour of the local roads.

The A247 has houses both sides for most of it with limited parking, so cars are parked on the road, reducing it to single lane status in many places. The junction with Broadmead roundabout leads in to small roads, already carrying far more cars than they were ever designed to do. This road also has dense terrace housing with no parking other than on the road. Have you ever tried driving down this road in the evening or when the A3 is blocked? It is simply gridlocked. The air pollution from the stationary cars and lorries is awful!

The proposed development at Garlick's Arch and the new on off slip roads from the A3 will turn our village into a solid roadblock at peak times, the road simply cannot carry the increase in traffic the development will bring!

I believe this site was a late addition to the plan and was put through under Regulation 19, and has not been previously consulted upon! This land is covered with ancient woodland and protected by the NPPF. Surely this is one of the sites the Green Belt was set up to protect, and is protected by this government! The scale of housing and industrial development is beyond belief!

The other sites on Send Hill and Winds Ridge are on single track rural roads, again not consulted upon, some of which is landfill with vents visible above the ground. These are country roads, quite and peaceful places and not suitable for the kind of development that is being proposed!

I appreciate that Send needs to play it's part in filling the need for housing, but this is a clear case of overdevelopment! Get this wrong and village life and all it brings will be lost forever, in the name of wealth and greed!

Please pass my comments on to the Planning Inspector.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5409  Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe this site was a late addition to the plan and was put through under Regulation 19, and has not been previously consulted upon! This land is covered with ancient woodland and protected by the NPPF. Surely this is one of the sites the Green Belt was set up to protect, and is protected by this government! The scale of housing and industrial development is beyond belief!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID: pslp172/2884  Respondent: 15143681 / Mark Clover  Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the changes in policy A43 Garlick's Arch because yet again GBC has ignored the thousands of previous objections to this beautiful Green belt for which no &quot;exceptional circumstances &quot; exist!! The sight has ancient woodland dating back to Elizabeth 1st, it is currently a level 2 flood zone. To build on it would effectively join Ripley and Send and surely this defeats the entire purpose of the Green Belt. The proposed 400 houses and 6 plots for traveling show people and the massive traffic increase will cause total gridlock to our already over used, under funded infrastructure!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We also have no where near enough school places for the current village, nor sufficient facilities to cover such an increase in the population at the Doctors surgery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/250  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A43 - I object to the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch for the same reasons as above. The increase in HGV traffic, should this go ahead, will cause more congestion and damage to the roads in and around Send. I also object to the proposed 400 houses. This is a new site that has not previously been consulted upon; it was not included in the Regulation 18 draft. There is no need for these additional houses on top of the thousands already proposed for the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment ID: pslp172/2538  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:**

| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
Policy A43 – I see that the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch has now been move to Burnt Common under Policy A58 and I will comment on that later. I object to the proposed 8 travelling show people plots on this site in addition to the 400 homes because there is no proven demand for them in this location and the lorries that will go along with these people will cause further congestion and pollution on the local roads.

The Local Plan H1 policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need”. Send has been disproportionately allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as all 8 travelling show people plots identified as needed in the borough until 2034. The developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden Hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches apiece during the same period. In addition the proposed location of these sites do not conform with the Guildford Borough Council’s own traveller policy in terms of the identified needs of this ethnicity of people; e.g. distance from schools, shops, transport and the need to join a community of people.

This land is ancient woodland allocated as Green Belt to avoid Ripley and Send being joined up. It is also subject to frequent flooding and has a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: psl172/3294  Respondent: 15143937 / Helen Strudwick  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I see that the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch has now been move to Burnt Common under Policy A58 and I object to the proposed 8 travelling show people plots on this site in addition to the 400 homes because there is no proven demand for them in this location and the lorries that will go along with these people will cause further congestion and pollution on the local roads.

The Local Plan H1 policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need”. Send has been disproportionately allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as all 8 travelling show people plots identified as needed in the borough until 2034. The developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden Hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches apiece during the same period. In addition the proposed location of these sites do not conform with the Guildford Borough Council’s own traveller policy in terms of the identified needs of this ethnicity of people; e.g. distance from schools, shops, transport and the need to join a community of people.

This land is ancient woodland allocated as Green Belt to avoid Ripley and Send being joined up. It is also subject to frequent flooding and has a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8034  Respondent: 15144065 / Margaret Heard  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object again in reference to policy P2, in particular to the land at Garlicks arch (A43) being removed from the green belt, as 'The Plan' states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding (Policy P4), as the Plan does not take properly address the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy. The site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. This area has flooded many times in recent years and therefore the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.

I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule. The Infrastructure Schedule sets out the key infrastructure requirements the Plan depends on. There is no schedule for Garlick’s Arch (A43), so the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site. It is therefore not fit for purpose.

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/1528  Respondent: 15144545 / Stacey Maxwell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The inclusion of 6 plots for travelling showpeople to the A43 Garlicks Arch site is frankly ludicrous in a rural environment within the Greenbelt. Our roads can’t cope with the size of the vehicles and storage facilities they will come equipped with. Why does Ripley have to have 75% of these plots? This is totally unacceptable and completely unbalanced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1862  Respondent: 15144737 / L M Wells  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the policy changes A43 at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh because -

1. The allocation of Travel lers/Showpeople sites is already excessive and out of all proportion even with reference to Local Plan Hi.
2. There are no "exceptional" circumstances for this important green belt to be developed and it is an important contribution to the control of flooding in the area which has sometimes been widespread in recent years.
3. Excessive traffic will result in increasing congestion, pollution and potential health risks to the local area and its residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/258  Respondent: 15144929 / Michael Simpson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

> I object to the local plan policy A 43.30 proposal to build so many houses in Send & Ripley area. Of course some new houses are required but Send and Ripley seem to be taking a disproportionate share of Guildford borough’s target and this feels unfair.
>
>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2877</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145057 / Vincent Francois</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garlick's Arch policy.
I object to the building of 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show People plots
- How would the occupancy of these plots and the flow of equipment to and from the plots be monitored
- HGVs would be required to move large equipment thus contributing to the existing traffic problems
- Building on this land would result in over development with no demarcation between villages thus defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
- This area is subject to flooding with flood zone 2 status
- It is contaminated by lead shot arising from shooting clubs, accumulated over many years
- It contains beautiful ancient woodland, the destruction of which would be a tragedy for the area and wild life
- The existence of high voltage pylons across this land has been ignored. These will provide a serious Health and Safety risk to occupants of the Traveler sites when they move equipment. This is Green Belt land and should remain so.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2712</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145121 / Irene Francois</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A43 - Garlick's Arch - I object to GBC intending to build 400 homes on this green and agricultural land and purposely destroying ancient woodland and in the process removing wild life habitat. Plus, I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Show People plots which would result in increased parking spaces for large vehicles and storage space. If this goes ahead it will fill our roads with more cars and HGVs.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2090</th>
<th>Respondent: 15145313 / T G Wells</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the policy changes A43 at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh because -
1. The allocation of Travellers/Showpeople sites is already excessive and out of all proportion even with reference to Local Plan Hi.
2. There are no "exceptional" circumstances for this important green belt to be developed and it is an important contribution to the control of flooding in the area which has sometimes been widespread in recent years.

3. Excessive traffic will result in increasing congestion, pollution and potential health risks to the local area and its residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/345</th>
<th>Respondent: 15147937 / julie rae</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3666</th>
<th>Respondent: 15148705 / Catriona Wilkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch in Burnt Common. There is no need to additional houses in the borough on top of those already proposed. This site is new and has not been previously consulted on. The proposed new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would be disastrous for Send. The road through send (A247) would be completely gridlocked during rush hours and would result in far too much fast moving traffic cutting through the village. It is already dangerous for children getting to school with the volume of fast moving traffic that don’t slow down by the school having left the A3. We cannot afford more traffic moving through the village and endangering our children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1596</th>
<th>Respondent: 15150817 / Robert Winborn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far from reducing the number of homes proposed for this site, the Council have again ignored substantial objections made regarding the impact of this site and have also added a proposal for 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. This despite there being no proven demand for this number of plots in this location. The proposals for this site are excessive, represent a substantial erosion of the Green Belt, and will generate huge amounts of traffic which the road system in Send and Ripley is completely unfit to cope with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch included at a later stage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/444  Respondent: 15153569 / Christopher Slinn  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

-It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

-It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

-It will generate excessive traffic that will block up local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/317  Respondent: 15154241 / Brendan Laing  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch. This is ancient woodland and farmland. There is no proportion to the scale development compared to the existing number of homes in Send Marsh, Burnt Common, and Ripley.

1. I also object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch because it will create increased traffic issues, pressure on local doctors, and schooling. There is no local secondary school without rush hour bus or train journeys.

1. Last year I wrote to Guildford council for a kerb to be installed outside my house. The response that this is normal for villages in the countryside. I object to the basis on which the proposed plan is diverting from existing principles and proposing 400 homes within 2 minutes walk from my house!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2616  Respondent: 15154241 / Brendan Laing  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A43: Garlicks Arch

The site is allocated for approximately 400 homes (C3), including some self-build and custom house building plots, and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)6 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis).

Policy H3: Rural exception homes

(1) Small affordable housing developments, including pitches for travellers, will be permitted to meet identified local affordable housing needs provided that:

(a) the site adjoins or is closely related to, and in safe and easy reasonable walking distance of a defined or a non-defined rural settlement, and

(b) the number, size and tenure of homes would be appropriate to meet, or to contribute to meeting, the identified local affordable housing needs of the local community

Policy A43a: Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

I agree with the removal of industrial usage (A43) on greenbelt as per National Planning Policy, but object to the inclusion of Travelling Showpeople plots.

I continue to object to the inappropriate use of ancient Green Belt land for 400 new houses (A43). This is not sufficient justification (H3) or exceptional circumstances. This is reckless destruction of green belt.

The argument in Policy H3 that it is ok to use green belt land for affordable housing if it is reasonable asking distance to a rural settlement is also not valid. Send is a good 60min walk, and Ripley 45min. This is unreasonable.

Furthermore the local Train station at Clandon is 60min walk. Furthermore the number and size of have no bearing on the needs of the local community! We have no need in Send, Ripley or Clandon for 400 new homes.

I continue to object to the need for a new slip road, especially since it has increased in size to 4.5ha and has no stated purpose or value. It will only lead to further congestion in and around our villages which are gridlocked daily.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Updated Plan be amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/327</th>
<th>Respondent: 15154849 / Julia Laing</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch. This is ancient woodland and farmland. There is no proportion to the scale development compared to the existing number of homes in Send Marsh, Burnt Common, and Ripley.

1. I also object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch because it will create increased traffic issues, pressure on local doctors, and schooling. There is no local secondary school without rush hour bus or train journeys.
1. Last year I wrote to Guildford council for a kerb to be installed outside my house. The response that this is normal for villages in the countryside. I object to the basis on which the proposed plan is diverting from existing principles and proposing 400 homes within 2 minutes walk from my house!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/335</th>
<th>Respondent: 15154977 / Janine Arthur</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch. This is ancient woodland and farmland. There is no proportion to the scale development compared to the existing number of homes in Send Marsh, Burnt Common, and Ripley.
2. I also object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch because it will create increased traffic issues, pressure on local doctors, and schooling. There is no local secondary school without rush hour bus or train journeys.
3. My partner wrote to Guildford council for a kerb to be installed outside my house. The response that this is normal for villages in the countryside. I object to the basis on which the proposed plan is diverting from existing principles and proposing 400 homes within 2 minutes walk from my house!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4044</th>
<th>Respondent: 15154977 / Janine Arthur</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is allocated for approximately 400 homes (C3), including some self-build and custom house building plots, and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)6 Travelling Showpeople plots (sui generis).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/340</th>
<th>Respondent: 15155201 / Ann Lay</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Guildford Local Plan for the following reasons:
5.) The inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley (Policy A43)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/343  **Respondent:** 15155393 / Heidi Powell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**Site A43 / Garlick’s Arch**

1. I object to this proposal. In isolation I would welcome the provision of a 4 way access to the A3 at Burnt Common as part of this development. However I feel very uncomfortable about the plan for this development alongside sites A35 & A25. This would create a band of housing development totalling 4400 properties in a ribbon running from M25 / J10 to Guildford on land that is greenbelt.

2. I am particularly worried about the traffic management around the Burnt Common area. This is already a busy junction with the Portsmouth Road and with potentially additional traffic from Woking, Clandon as well as those travelling north & south on the A3. I fear this would become a major bottleneck.

Please will you take my comments into consideration.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/346  **Respondent:** 15155617 / David Vallath-Patel  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/8305  **Respondent:** 15156673 / Emma France  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Policy A 43. 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft which has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/361  **Respondent:** 15157505 / Linda Leunissen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

Policy A 43. 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft which has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The site is not appropriate because:

- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat. Any ancient woodland should be protected for future generations.
- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/363  Respondent: 15157601 / Barbara Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch. This is ancient woodland and farmland. There is no proportion to the scale development compared to the existing number of homes in Send Marsh, Burnt Common, and Ripley.

1. I also object to the proposed development at Garlic's Arch because it will create increased traffic issues, pressure on local doctors, and schooling. There is no local secondary school without rush hour bus or train journeys.

1. Last year I wrote to Guildford council for a kerb to be installed outside my house. The response that this is normal for villages in the countryside. I object to the basis on which the proposed plan is diverting from existing principles and proposing 400 homes within 2 minutes walk from my house!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

The site is not appropriate because, there are no plans to improve schools, surgeries, or utilities.

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt, and I do not believe there are valid 'exceptional circumstances' for its removal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

POLICY A43

Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh

Do we in Send really need 400 homes? They won't be affordable to the young of the area which means my youngsters will be pushed out. As far as I know the travelling showman live in the Dorking area not Send. Any residents in these houses you plan on building won't like the big diesel vehicles and generators travelling in and out. Now we know diesel is a dangerous polluter why put them in an area with houses.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/478  Respondent: 15174145 / Kathleen Mylet  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I object to the plan to build 400 houses and 7000 square metres of light industrial units at Garlick's Arch, Sendmarsh, Ripley. (A43)

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt.

Also, it is an Ancient Woodland with trees going back to the 16th Century and is full of wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/584  Respondent: 15174145 / Kathleen Mylet  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Below are my objections to the above plan:

1. I object to the excessive number of houses proposed for the Garlick's Arch site, Policy A43 changes.

   It will ruin the character of both Send and Ripley.

   The extra traffic generated by the new residents will lead to chaos on the local roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/210  Respondent: 15177313 / Stephen Brunskill  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 for various reasons. The tens of thousands of objections already made are simply ignored by GBC. The number of homes is excessive. The junction of the B368 Send Marsh Road and B2215 Portsmouth Road is already extremely difficult to exit particularly when turning right and the c1000 additional cars in Garlick’s Arch will make this whole area a traffic nightmare. Also the whole area of Garlick’s Arch floods every Winter and there is much documented
photo evidence of this as there is a clay shooting club who use the area and they regularly shoot over what is essentially a lake. It has a flood zone 2 allocation. There is NO proven demand for travelling showpeople plots in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/421  Respondent: 15178113 / Jack Hornblow  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

objects to
9) and development at garlic arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3402  Respondent: 15178369 / Geoffrey Wilkinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Far from reducing the number of homes proposed for this site, the Council have again ignored substantial objections made regarding the impact of this site and have also added a proposal for six travelling show-people plots. This despite there being no proven demand for this number of plots in this location. The proposals for this site are excessive, represent a substantial erosion of the Green Belt, and will generate huge amounts of traffic which the road system in Send and Ripley is completely unfit to cope with.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1650  Respondent: 15180193 / Paul Bedworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

a. Once again, the process is illogical. Thousands of previous objections have been ignored. This makes no sense.

b. It will join up the villages of Ripley and Send, and defy the whole purpose of the greenbelt.
c. The local road infrastructure in Send and Ripley is not able to handle the resulting increase in traffic volumes.

d. This ancient woodland has been there for many hundreds of years. It fails “exceptional circumstances” criteria for developing the greenbelt.

e. Demand for housing figures have decreased since the last plan, yet despite this, the houses allocated to Send has gone up. Again this makes no sense.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp172/2055 | Respondent: 15183393 / D Greenman | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43
I strongly object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch as it ignores all previous objections of the local people. There is no proven need for plots for "Travelling Showpeople" in this area. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature] This is not wanted in Send or Ripley, Policy 43 should be abandoned forthwith. This area is a permanent Green Belt site and there are absolutely no "exceptional circumstances" for this Policy. The Policy Plan will cause over development of Send and Ripley the number of homes is excessive. Once again 400 homes will amount to another six to eight hundred cars on the local roads. The local roads are already at grid lock at peak periods, as stated earlier the chance of road rage and the possibility of a nasty incident will increase. The ancient woodland of this area has existed since the 15th Century and the reign of Elizabeth 1, what gives you the right to destroy it??? The area is has a flood zone 2 allocation, is this to be ignored as well as the Conservative promise of not building on Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp172/511 | Respondent: 15184993 / Muriel Millar | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to policy A43 change because 8 pitches would be [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature].

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/439 | Respondent: 15185537 / Peter Mills | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

D. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. The site is not appropriate because there is no sustainable transport infrastructure, there is flooding liability and there are no plans to improve services to cope

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/442  Respondent: 15185537 / Peter Mills  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan for no good reason.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3330  Respondent: 15185857 / Matthew Monk  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Secondly , I object to policy A43 for the change at Garlicks arch for the following reasons.
One: There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this area.
Two: It will join Ripley up with Send, defeating the purpose of greenbelt, loosing any sense of the traditional villages.
Three- It is subject to frequent flooding- this land needs to be there to prevent issues flooding other houses downstream of the river.
Four- It will create excessive traffic. Over the last 20 years the traffic has increased dramatically. If it continues to increase the whole area will become a permanently gridlocked.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3321  Respondent: 15186273 / Suzannah Monk  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Secondly I object to Policy A43 for the change at Garlick's Arch for the following reasons.

One: There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this area.  [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]

Two: It will join Ripley up with Send, defeating the purpose of greenbelt, losing any sense of the traditional villages.

Three: It is subject to frequent flooding- this land needs to be there to prevent issues flooding other houses downstream of the river.

Four: It will create excessive traffic. Over the last 20 years the traffic has increased dramatically. If it continues to increase the whole area will become a permanent traffic jam.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2535  Respondent: 15186305 / Joe Strudwick  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 – I see that the proposed employment space at Garlick’s Arch has now been move to Burnt Common under Policy A58 and I will comment on that later. I object to the proposed 8 travelling show people plots on this site in addition to the 400 homes because there is no proven demand for them in this location and the lorries that will go along with these people will cause further congestion and pollution on the local roads.

The Local Plan H1 policy states that “Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Show people accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need”. Send has been disproportionately allocated 2 traveller pitches as well as all 8 travelling show people plots identified as needed in the borough until 2034. The developments of over 1500 houses at Gosden Hill and Wisley are only allocated 8 pitches apiece during the same period. In addition the proposed location of these sites do not conform with the Guildford Borough Council’s own traveller policy in terms of the identified needs of this ethnicity of people; e.g. distance from schools, shops, transport and the need to join a community of people.

This land is ancient woodland allocated as Green Belt to avoid Ripley and Send being joined up. It is also subject to frequent flooding and has a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/445  Respondent: 15186881 / Patrick Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I refer to the draft Local Plan and specifically the part relating to what you call Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common.
This is designated for 400 houses and industrial and warehousing. I object to the proposal. I currently use the land for clay pigeon shooting.

I believe this site is a new proposed site for building and has not been the subject of previous consultation. It is Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances allowing for any building on it. There is an area of ancient woodland.

A new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would be disastrous for Send and would open Send as a through route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3 for Woking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to site A43 Garlick’s Arch, and the destroying of wildlife habitats on this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to site A43 Garlick’s Arch. The alteration to now allocate a minimum of 400 houses, and add 6 show people Plots will have a significant impact on the quality of life for people already living in the area, because of huge increase in traffic trying to use our already clogged roads.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the plans outlined for Site A43. This site is new to the overall plans and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft proposal and so it has not previously had any level of consultation. The removal of this land from the Green Belt requires exceptional circumstances and I do not see that the case has been made for this; in the long-term, developments such as this one may be detrimental to the overall goal of preventing urban sprawl and the merging of settlements such as Guildford and Woking. The provision of housing on this scale at this location would also have a significant impact on the schools in the local area; for example, Send infant school is currently being rebuilt but there is no plan for any increase in capacity. I understand that the site contains an ancient woodland and so the development would endanger trees from C16 and so there are conservation issues with the selection of this site.

I also object to the plans for the industrial development; the 2015 Employment Land Needs Assessment indicated a reduction of 80% in the requirements for employment floor space while this proposal is a repeat of that contained in a previous draft local plan that used an older evidence base. If there is a need for further development of industrial space, there should be consideration given to an expansion of Slyfield as this seems to be a very appropriate site for such.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the proposed changes to policy A43 as it takes no account of the many objections to this development made in the response to the 2016 draft Local Plan. I have seen no evidence of demand for plots for travelling showpeople at this site and I also do not see that there are any ‘exceptional circumstances’ that would justify development on the Green Belt at this location. The total number of homes proposed is very high considering the overall size of Send village without any planned increase in infrastructure necessary for such a development. It also seems likely to join Send and Ripley, thereby directly going against one of the key purposes of the Green Belt. I am also concerned about the impact of this number of homes upon the local traffic system.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy A43 I object to the land at Garlick's Arch designated for 400 houses. This site was not in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon. The industrial development is not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous draft plan. There is a 40ha site available at Slyfield. The additional traffic resulting from such a development would increase the traffic on Send Road and the Portsmouth Road at Ripley which are already gridlocked at peak times as is the A3.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/312</th>
<th>Respondent: 15196161 / Michael Corlett</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh

I object to the inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots for which there is no demand. This is a beautiful site of ancient woodland and subject to flooding. It is Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances as to why this should be developed. All my previous objections regarding increased traffic still stand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/524</th>
<th>Respondent: 15198337 / Jack Tallick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/730</th>
<th>Respondent: 15198913 / Diana Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) The Garlick's Arch (Policy A43) proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq. metres of light/ general industrial/ storage distribution space on the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1146  **Respondent:** 15199009 / Alan Toomey  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 Garlicks Arch Send Marsh because this increase completely ignores all previous objections, the traffic is already terrible up to the shell roundabout at to the junction opposite garlicks arch at send march road, it will grid lock traffic all through send and back to old woking. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. Green belt should always be protected, this is a travesty that our children and grandchildren will blame you all for, Ripley and send will no longer be villages but a town we might as well rename as RIPSENDOFFLY which if approver is what you have done, who would want to buy a home on land with polluted land (lead shot) lets see you and the developer cover that one up to purchasers, ancient wood land and frequent flooding which will be made much worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/544  **Respondent:** 15205569 / Mark Gurdon  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

2. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

3. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/559  **Respondent:** 15205729 / John Walker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

2. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

3. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick's Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/563  Respondent: 15205729 / John Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5).

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick's Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick's Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/551  Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. Insufficient thought has been given to how the local infrastructure could cope with the additional traffic.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. The office block on the Portsmouth road at Burnt common has remained unoccupied for 10 years.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding, with regular flooding on Portsmouth road where the river had to be diverted and culverted at the intersection with Send Marsh Road.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1397  Respondent: 15205921 / Elizabeth Howlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43, the development of 400 houses at Garlick's Arch. This is a huge development to be built on the green belt. This is unreasonable and out of all proportion to local needs. The Old Portsmouth Road from Burnt Common to the A3 roundabout is already overloaded. The intersection in Ripley regularly blocks solid during busy periods as does the slip road onto the A3. At the Burnt Common intersection the roundabout is regularly blocked with queues in all directions trying to feed from and on to the A3 slip into and onto Send Barns Lane.

I also wish to object to the setting aside for travellers and show people. Ther is no justifiable need. Your addendum notes state that you determined the need by 'asking them' very scientific. They children and mothers on these uncontrolled sites are particularly denied access to proper healthcare, and education. We need to break the cycle and provide permanent occupation, close to the services they need. Local services are already overloaded, local children already have to be bussed out of the area for their education.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/557  Respondent: 15206497 / Vivien Bancroft  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/586  **Respondent:** 15208289 / M. J Payne  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A 43. 30ha LAND AT GARLICK'S ARCH,BURNT COMMON

I object to the size of this development on Green Belt land as it would have the affect of practically joining Ripley and Send together. This seems to have replaced the Burnt Common site which together with Slyfield would have been more suitable for some industrial development. The new 4-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be a disaster for Send and the traffic it would generate on the A247 Send Road through the village. This would become an even busier through route to Woking on an already, at times, gridlocked road, taking many heavy lorries, with the access to two schools directly in to this traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/587  **Respondent:** 15208353 / Janet Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/591  **Respondent:** 15208353 / Janet Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4) Policy A43. 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.

There is no need for anymore houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. **There are no exceptional circumstances.** The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is simply not required since the latest (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. **Send cannot take it.**

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/593  Respondent: 15208417 / Colin Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch

4) Policy A43. 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.

There is no need for anymore houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is simply not required since the latest (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/598  Respondent: 15208513 / Lauren Green  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2) I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch

4) Policy A43. 30 ha Land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.

There is no need for anymore houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be endangered.

The proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is simply not required since the latest (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
2) I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch

4) Policy A43. 30 ha Land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing.

There is no need for anymore houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000sq m is simply not required since the latest (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would be disastrous for Send. Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and the A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. Send cannot take it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I Object to the site A43 Garlick’s Arch

Garlick’s Arch is a 100 acre site of Green Belt and ancient woodland which should be protected.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

13. We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1719</th>
<th>Respondent: 15220097 / Douglas Barr Trudy Amos</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.**

*Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots*

We object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/652</th>
<th>Respondent: 15220321 / K P Buchanan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the industrial development at Garlick's Arch. It is inappropriate in this area, it is not required (see Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015) and there is a 40ha industrial site at Slyfield which is far more appropriate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/655</th>
<th>Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( No ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( No )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Object
This is Greenbelt land, the area can not be destroyed by development.

There is not sufficient infrastructure in place to support such a development. The roads will be snarled up with traffic.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6386  **Respondent:** 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I also object to 400 houses and 7000 Metres of Industrial space at Garlick’s arch, there is plenty of Industrial space at Slyfield. It is totally inappropriate at Garlick’s Arch because apart from flooding, it is ancient woodland.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6421  **Respondent:** 15225281 / Roger Gamlin  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no special circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement has been complied with for this site. It only come to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National planning policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. The site is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. The development of the site will increase the risk of flooding. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should not be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and wood peckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

Given the site’s proximity to the A3 it will suffer from considerable noise pollution, which would be detrimental to all residents. The level of traffic along the A3 and with the road often being congested will result in a poor air quality for the site.

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1227</th>
<th>Respondent: 15225281 / Roger Gamlin</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch

I object to Policy A43 because it is permanent Green Belt and must be preserved for future generations.

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople Plots.

It will cause overdevelopment in the village which is already bursting at seams, There are no exceptional circumstances which warrant demolishing ancient woodland which has been a beauty spot since Queen Elizabeth 1.

This will generate excessive traffic compounding a traffic flow problem.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1393</th>
<th>Respondent: 15227809 / David Hall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43)

I strongly object to the proposed development of this area and its inclusion at a very late stage in the Proposal which would appear to be questionable in-so-far as ‘Correct Process’ has not been followed
This area is unsullied Green Belt land partially covered in ancient woodland, that was not considered as a potential ‘Development Area’ in the 2014 consultation. In fact during 2014 a planning application to build 25 houses in this area was rejected on ‘Sound Planning Grounds’.

It is therefore, to my mind, inconceivable that suddenly it has become acceptable to build 400 houses together with 7,000 sq.metres designated for light industrial usage on this Green Belt Land.

In additional to all this, is the fact that there is no existing or potential infrastructure which would be required to support such a development.

Further, the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA conducted by GBC in 2013, which indicates that there is absolutely no need for the proposed 7,000 Sq.m. development at Burnt Common

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1250  **Respondent:** 15227809 / David Hall  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch –Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley

Again, the many thousands of objections to the proposed development in the 2016 Consultation have been completely ignored with respect to this Green Belt land.

Now 8 Pitches/Plots for ‘Travelling/Showpeople have been added to the original 400 houses, without any proven demand or requirement.

There has not been any visible consideration given to the infrastructure which would be required to support this type of expansion. This proposal is impractical

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/692  **Respondent:** 15228833 / S Allwood  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7000 houses sq metres as it is not required in this area. There are many more industrial sites standing empty in the surrounding area and the proposal for the housing is new and has not been consulted upon. The new 4 way interchange on to the A3 at Burnt Common would cause major road blockages on our small roads which are already very busy and getting busier.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/696</th>
<th>Respondent: 15229313 / Caitlin Gordon</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The Garlick's Arch (Policy A43) proposal to build 400 houses and 7,000 sq. metres of light/ general industrial/ storage distribution space on the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/708</th>
<th>Respondent: 15231489 / Alan Road</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the planned development of 400 housed at Garlicks Arch, with the consequence for traffic and effect on flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposed development of an industrial site in this ancient woodland, again, this will have massive impact on traffic and flooding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object, that should this plan be passed, the consequence for the people of these villages would be disastrous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please reply to this letter and ensure that it is placed before the Inspector for his consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/720</th>
<th>Respondent: 15233217 / Mary Allwood</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to more industrial units being built. There are a lot of empty units around our area so it is a completely useless idea and would make the roads much busier than they already are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/724</th>
<th>Respondent: 15233633 / Hilary Head</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) I object to the site A43 Garlicks arch, the proposal to build 400 houses and industrial space. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/734  Respondent: 15234017 / Martin Head  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/737  Respondent: 15234113 / Paul Wilkinson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please note my objection to the draft local plan. I particularly object to the villages of Send, Ripley and Clandon being removed from the Green Belt and site A43 Garlicks Arch. This kind of development will have a negative impact of the surrounding area and affect the 'atmosphere' of the villages. Ripley is a particularly thriving community based around traditional village activities. Over population and ever increasing traffic will greatly affect this. Already there are limited school places and demand on other local facilities in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/759  Respondent: 15234849 / Alastair Fleming  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan.

5. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.

6. I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick's Arch as the residents will have have to rely on the use of private cars.
7. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick's Arch (Policy 43).

8. I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/753  Respondent: 15236769 / Linda Aboel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not required but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and you have refused to disclose your calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites the Green Belt is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5151  Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A45 Garlick Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1721  Respondent: 15238049 / Glenda Charlick  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the local plan of building on Green Belt land. Site A43 Garlick's Arch increase of housing will be extremely harmful to the rural area of Ripley, Send and Clandon.

The inclusion of 6 x travelling show people plots with storage facilities is entirely inappropriate on Green Belt Land with the designated formula for 1500 to 1999 homes is out of scale.
The increase of industrial floor space to an unspecified amount does not provide enough information for a proper consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/770   Respondent: 15239297 / T Fleming   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4. I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common and the proposed 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial warehousing on that site (Policy 43). Policy A43 and A43A were included at the last minute. They were not in the Regulation 18 draft and had not been consulted upon prior to the inclusion 2016 Local Plan.

5. I object to the impact of Policy A43 on ancient woodland on that site, on noise pollution and air pollution levels. The site is also prone to flooding.

6. I object to the impact of Policy A43 and A43A on local infrastructure. Congestion levels on A247 are already increasing at an alarming rate and will be further exacerbated by the development of Garlick's Arch as the residents will have to rely on the use of private cars.

7. I object to the unsustainable nature of the site at Garlick's Arch (Policy 43).

8. I object to the inclusion of policy A43 of 7000sq m of industrial warehousing as the latest £ Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft. Slyfield Industrial Estate still has spare capacity and could accommodate any additional warehousing need if required.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/790   Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore   Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. The inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch, which has ancient woodland, is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance. The Plan states the preference is for the use of previously developed land. GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/791   Respondent: 15240161 / R O Moore   Agent:  

12. The employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/800  Respondent: 15240929 / P. A. Finch  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the developments as Garlicks Arch is protected as it is in a Green Belt area and there are no exceptional circumstances to remove it from the Green Belt as housing need is not an exceptional circumstance as stated by Central Government.

The plan states that it would be preferable to use previously developed land but Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common without reason.

I object to the proposed new industrial sites at Garlicks Arch as this will result in a loss of employment for local people in the four existing rural businesses.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1714  Respondent: 15241313 / Christine Relf  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the following with reference to the above development.

We object to the Local Plan as the development proposed is not sustainable.

We object to not protecting Green Belt land between the villages. Ripley, Send and Clandon

We object to due to congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and lack of road infrastructure.

We object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding and have done so in the past.

We object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common.
We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley.

We object to the poor air quality that extra traffic will make within the villages as traffic use to connect with M25 and A3 every day.

We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for site.

We object to 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial buildings opposite Send Marsh road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildfords housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green belt is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1693  Respondent: 15241313 / Christine Relf  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh.

1) it ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

2) there is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.

3) it is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist.

4) it will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive.

5) it is exquisite ancient woodland that existed the time of Elizabeth1.

6) it will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt.

7) it is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.

8) it is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years.

9) it will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley which have very heavy traffic now without accommodating extra traffic this will cause.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/858  Respondent: 15245697 / Justine Butler  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT TO site A43 Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/878  Respondent: 15246497 / G F Bennett  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan is to build 400 new homes under a revised local plan. This would surely cause havoc.

I also object to the lack of evidence for the provision of new schools, doctors surgeries, not to mention drainage/sewage facilities and public transport. Chaos would be caused by traffic. In this day and age the norm has become for most houses to have 2 or 3 cars. The mind boggles at the number of cars on these local roads at any one time, especially in rush hour.

I object also to the short amount of notice given to the inhabitants of the above mentioned villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/896  Respondent: 15248161 / Fabio Ligi  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. A recent survey (Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015) shows it is not required. I understand that there is already a site that could be used at Slyfield that is more appropriate. In addition, Garlick’s Arch has an area of ancient wood that it is a crime to destroy. I understand the area is liable to flood as well.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/916  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/917  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

12. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)
There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1370  Respondent: 15248481 / Jamie McCallister  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.
The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

*The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did]*”

*The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4066</th>
<th>Respondent: 15251105 / Michael McGrath</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the Policy A43 change because:

- It disregards the overwhelming number of previous objections from local residents which have been ignored.
- The inclusion of pitches for travellers and showpeople is contrary to any proven evidence that there is a demand for such facilities in the foreseeable future.
- The land at this location is Green Belt and must be retained to prevent increasing urbanisation and to preserve the natural habitat of ancient woodland and allow biodiversity to function alongside built-up environments.
- The area has high levels of existing vehicle movements along the A3, A247 and B2215 routes and any reduction in green spaces reduces the opportunities for atmospheric CO2

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/932</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253217 / W Orchard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11).

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3528</th>
<th>Respondent: 15253953 / Olivia Bedworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</td>
<td>is Sound? ( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43 I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley. It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist.
• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive.
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/942  Respondent: 15254113 / R Orchard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the location for new employment floorspace at Garlick's Arch - Site A43 (Policy E2).

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class B 1 c, B2 and B8) floorspace will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Garlick’s Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/948  Respondent: 15254113 / R Orchard  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (82) and storage and distribution (88). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11).

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT TO THE PLANS OUTLINED IN POLICY A43 on the grounds that this area is Green Belt and is therefore protected from development. It is a wildlife habitat. What does The Council propose to do about this? The brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common is large enough for the 7,000 sq. m. suggested for further development. If the Council builds on this area, the small, beautiful country villages of Ripley and Send will become suburbs of Guildford in no time at all and their uniqueness and beauty will be lost forever. Please don’t touch our Green Belt! This why we moved to this area, because it is unspoilt! I also object to the plan for 400 new
homes, on the grounds that there is insufficient infrastructure to maintain this level of development, viz: health centres, schools etc. I also strongly object to the manner in which this plan was put forward at the last moment, without consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
Garlick’s Arch

1.27 Garlick’s Arch at 400 homes, represents an approximate increase of 56% on the total household numbers in Send Marsh / Burnt Common. This can only be considered to be ‘substantial growth’. The size of the allocated site and the number of new dwellings proposed cannot be considered to represent a ‘proportionate extension’ of the village but rather representative of substantial growth.

1.28 Policy A43 and the allocation of ‘Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley’ is therefore contrary to the settlement hierarchy established in the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and its inclusion in the Local Plan is therefore considered to be unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Overview

9.1 This section provides an overview and assessment of the relevant allocated sites which are currently set out in the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016.

9.2 In total the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016 sets out a total of 37 allocated sites which relate to housing (C3) or mixed use redevelopment.

9.3 As set out in Section 4 of these representations the proposed allocations for housing delivery within the Borough rely heavily on strategic sites which are intended to deliver the majority of the overall OAN requirement.

9.4 Key sites also allocated within Send Marsh include site allocation numbers A43 and A43a which relate to ‘Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley’ and ‘Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh / Burnt Common’.

9.5 Further consideration of these sites are set out below

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley

9.6 ‘Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley’ is allocated for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) as set out in Policy A43 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and Sites June 2016.
9.7 The site is approximately 30 ha in size and is stated to have an existing use of paddock and builder’s yard. This includes Grade 2 agricultural land as set out in the spreadsheet which accompanies Table C – Site Options Appraisal of Appendix IV of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

9.8 It is noted that this ‘site’ was not previously included in the Regulation 18 consultation for the emerging Local Plan and has been included at a very late stage in the development process of the Local Plan. The draft of the plan presented to the Executive Advisory Board on 13th April 2016 did not include the Garlick’s Arch. By the time the plan was considered at the Extraordinary Council meeting on 24th May 2016, it had been added.

9.9 ‘Land around Burnt Common Warehouse’ which was the previously allocated strategic site in the Regulation 18 consultation has now been removed from the proposed allocations.

9.10 Section 9 of these representations considers the performance of ‘Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley’ in the Sustainability Appraisal. This illustrates that the site performs poorly when compared to the other sites considered for Send and Send Marsh against several criteria including flood risk, distance from nearby amenities including schools, railway stations and recreational facilities. In addition the site is also categorised in the Sustainability Appraisal as high quality agricultural land and not previously developed land which also contributes to its poor performance against the appraisal criteria.

9.11 Send Marsh/Burntcommon is designated as a ‘large village’ which is defined in the ‘Guildford Borough Settlement Hierarchy’ as being “unsuitable for substantial growth but capable of accommodating a proportionate extension.”

9.12 The office for national statistics breaks down the 2011 Census records into various neighbourhood areas. The relevant areas in relation to our site are:

- Neighbourhood Area Guildford 001D – Burnt Common
- Neighbourhood Area Guildford 001E – Send Marsh.

9.13 The statistics for these areas show that there are 456 households in Send Marsh and 505 in Burnt Common. Based on the mid 2011 population estimates this gives an average of 2.68 people per household across both neighbourhood areas.

9.14 Using the Council’s population figure of 1,931 from 2011 for Send Marsh / Burntcommon and applying this 2.68 average then there are estimated to be approximately 720 households in Send Marsh / Burntcommon.

9.15 Garlick’s Arch at 400 homes therefore, represents an approximate increase of 56% on the total household numbers in Send Marsh / Burntcommon. This can only be considered to be ‘substantial growth’. The size of the allocated site and the number of new dwellings proposed cannot be considered to represent a ‘proportionate extension’ of the village but rather representative of substantial growth.

9.16 Policy A43 and the allocation of ‘Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley’ is therefore contrary to the settlement hierarchy established in the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and its inclusion in the Local Plan is therefore considered to be unsound.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the 400 houses and the 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing at Garlick's Arch. This site was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been subject to consultation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/971  Respondent: 15256769 / Freda Boyle  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Garlick's Arch Policy A43. Policy A44 1.9ha. Policy 42. I object with the following points on these policies:

1. The building on the Green Belt at Send at Garlick's Arch, Clockbarn Nurseries and Send Hill because it is not justified by any special circumstances and the fact that Green Belt is meant to be permanent and not continually eroded. Garlick's Arch has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the h century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

2. The development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

3. The proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

4. To building 45 houses at Clockbarn because of inadequate access and traffic volume. Tannery Lane is far too narrow and bendy to take any more traffic. The junction with Send Road is already very hazardous for vehicles emerging into the main road. Planning permission has already been given for 64 houses at the Tannery and the new marina will generate heavy traffic too. The lane and the main A247 road cannot take any more.

5. To the development of 40 houses at Send Hill due to its high quality Green Belt amenity within an area of beautiful countryside which would be spoilt. The subsoil of the existing site contains documented unsafe land fill waste which is currently vented.

6. The proposal to include 2 Travellers Pitches is completely inappropriate due to the narrow width single track country road providing insufficient access to the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1018  Respondent: 15256769 / Freda Boyle  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Policy A43A. I object to this policy on the following point:

1. The proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because it would be disastrous for Send and the (A247) would be gridlocked all day. I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/M25.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/969</th>
<th>Respondent: 15256833 / C J Vickers</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3305  Respondent: 15257953 / Brian Middlemiss  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 to further increase the Garlicks Arch massive development which would join Send and Ripley with no effective Green Belt divide and create huge traffic increases on the Old Portsmouth Road and surrounding local roads/lanes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1020  Respondent: 15258401 / Lynda Pullen  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch for 400 houses, which was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks' notice and without any prior consultation. This has been quite disgraceful. Also this proposed development is simply not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick's Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch because the site has particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which have existed since the 16th century would be endangered. The site is attractive open countryside and part of the permanent Green Belt, with is protected under the National Policy Framework. It also represents an unrestricted sprawl and goes against the purposes of the Green Belt which include the prevention of merging towns and settlements. Oh yes, and the site is also subject to flooding!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1059  Respondent: 15262273 / Michael Mead  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
I have previously objected to the proposed development of 400 houses on this Green Belt prime Agricultural land and historic woods. The new policy A43 now adds eight travelling/showpeople pitches to this development rendering the Policy even more inappropriate for the majority of G Rated properties within a 2 mile radius of this area.

The Borough council is reminded that in past 2/3 years it refused planning application for Oldlands to build 25 houses in the same location. The Council therefore cannot still incorporate this Policy within the Plan and still maintain that it applies Consistant Practice in their Planning Policy.
This proposal would increase the local population so considerably and destroy totally the villages of Send and Ripley which in reality is not something that Ratepayers, in West Clandon, Send, and Ripley together with outlying areas would be prepared to accept. There is certainly no genuine reason to destroy Green Belt and Ancient Woodland which it contains, when Brown field sites within GBC areas could be used.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4506  Respondent: 15262305 / L J Crane  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1065  Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15.1 OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4627  Respondent: 15263073 / James Walker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.
24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1072  Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15.I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4602  Respondent: 15263905 / Philip Walker  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1077  Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15.I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4607  Respondent: 15264001 / Robert Peake  Agent:  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to rely on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming even more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1725  Respondent: 15264225 / Mel McVickers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A 43.

I object to policy A 43 at Garlick’s Arch because.

1. The council have totally disregarded the thousands of objections which have been made people who live in the area.
2. Why make provision for travelling show people when there is absolutely no indication that there is a need for this facility in this area.
3. The number of homes suggested 400 plus is serious overdevelopment in our small village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1715  Respondent: 15264449 / Elaine McVickers  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A 43.

I object to policy A 43 at Garlick’s Arch because.

1. The council have totally disregarded the thousands of objections which have been made people who live in the area.
2. Why make provision for travelling show people when there is absolutely no indication that there is a need for this facility in this area.
3. The number of homes suggested 400 plus is serious overdevelopment in our small village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6866  Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6867</th>
<th>Respondent: 15265377 / Emma Thompson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is disastrous as the increased volume of traffic would impact the local communities. The increased traffic from London (M25) to Woking would go through Burnt Common, Send and Old Woking, which currently cannot cope with the existing traffic. This is unsustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1083</th>
<th>Respondent: 15265793 / Sam Rowley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1087</th>
<th>Respondent: 15265889 / Christine Croston</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1091  Respondent: 15266305 / A Andrews  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 Land at Garlic Arch. This is a new site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances since it is covered by and ancient woodland. The proposed industrial site if singularly not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ENLA) shows a reduction of 80 per cent in requirement needs of employment floor space from the previous draft plan. A new four way interchange on to the A3 at Burnt Common to serve this development would create gridlock. Have you ever tried crossing the road especially in the rush hour nigh impossible. This is a ridiculous idea and really needs to be looked at very carefully. A full transparency should be made available and looked into very carefully, otherwise gridlock will be the result. These roads are not suitable for thousands of cars.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7226  Respondent: 15274241 / Chris Finden-Browne  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to Policy A43 which covers 30ha of land at Garlick's Arch, Burnt Common on multiple grounds:
  ◦ Again, this site is a new entry in the Plan and was NOT included in the Regulation 18 draft or previous consultations.
  ◦ There is no need for an additional 400 houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough.
  ◦ The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is not required: the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ENLA) shows an 80% reduction in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If such space should indeed be required, it should be located at sites already serving this purpose, such as Slyfield.
The site contains ancient woodland, an already too rare occurrence in these environs for which the loss would be significant.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5887  Respondent: 15275201 / Jennifer Morritt  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7971  Respondent: 15278369 / Ripley Parish Council (Jim Morris)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

RPC objects to the insetting of Send and Burnt Common in general, but particularly objects to the extension of the settlement to exclude the Garlick’s Arch site from the Green Belt and to allocate the land for built development. In the case of Site A43 and Site A43a, Send Marsh/Burnt Common, the insetting of the Garlick’s Arch allocation appears to have no other justification than the very late substitution of the Garlick’s Arch site at the Executive Meeting on 24th May 2016 itself.

The site continues to serve a number of the Green Belt purposes and is an important green buffer to the A3 and of ecological and landscape importance.

There is nothing stated in the reasoned justification in the Plan to indicate that any exceptional circumstances exist to justify the allocation and the insetting of the Green Belt boundary.

It does not appear to have been identified by the process of criteria-based assessment of site through which other sites were identified for allocation and there is no explanation for the substitution of the original A43 allocation “land around Burnt Common Warehouse” which was much more appropriate, given its largely previously developed character.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 “Garlick’s Arch”

62. This site is currently open rural greenfield land within the Green Belt. It has been allocated, at the last moment, for 400 homes and up to 7000 sq m of either B1(c) light industrial or a mix of Bi(c), B2 Industrial and/or B8 storage and distribution. The emergence of this site only in the Regulation 19 draft of the PSLP means that the principle of the allocation of site has not been subject to the earlier consultations and this is the only opportunity to influence the Plan before its submission to the Secretary of State. This is particularly regrettable and prejudicial given that the proposal of this site as a site for 400 new dwellings, and the provision of slip roads to A3 via policy A43A only emerged through the decision of the Council’s Executive on 11 May 2016. This meeting was held without proper notice or any opportunity for consultation to make an unexplained substitution for the site given the same policy number, on previously developed land west known as Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send, allocated for approximately 100 homes and 7000 sq m of B class industrial uses.

63. The ministerial foreword to the NPPF by minister Greg Clark states: “because planning policy itself has become so elaborate and forbidding – the preserve of specialists, rather than people in communities. This National Planning Policy Framework changes that. By replacing over a thousand pages of national policy with around fifty, written simply and clearly, we are allowing people and communities back into planning.” [emphasis added]

64. The NPPF makes it clear that:
“69 The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning.”

65. Those words sound more than a little hollow in the context of this decision, which has not gone through the exhaustive process of sieving and consulting on site allocation proposals. It is plain that the late introduction of this important and damaging proposal took place in direct breach of the approach in NPPF which seeks to involve and consult communities about proposals that affect them.

66. The site was identified in the Pegasus Report Vol 5 in 2013 as site B14, together with site B13 as part of a possible – “major village expansion”. This was rejected and not taken forward in the 2014 draft Local Plan, although the previously developed site “Land around Burnt Common warehouse “… B13 was originally allocated as A43. RPC did not object to that allocation.

67. However, the deletion of the original A43 site and its substitution with the Garlick’s Arch site is unacceptable for a number of reasons.
68. The site was assessed in the Guildford Borough Land Availability Assessment (LAA) February 2016, but as far as the RPC has been able to establish, this is the only recent assessment of the site.

69. The assessment in the LAA is woefully inadequate. The site is in an unsustainable location, poorly served by public transport, with little or no access to services and community facilities and with a noise environment dominated by traffic noise from the A3. The site does not appear to have been considered as part of the SEA/ Sustainability Assessment and it is not clear why the additional 300 dwellings are required in this location.

70. There has been no assessment of ecological impacts either in terms of species or habitats. Yet the site is well known for the presence of red kites, sparrowhawks. Bats (several species), Owls (several species) badgers, deer, foxes, and many species of invertebrates.
71. It is not clear whether, given its late inclusion, statutory consultees such as Natural England were consulted over its inclusion. The public were not consulted.

72. A site of this scale and nature should have been proposed through the local plan process so as to ensure proper consultation. It was not considered in any earlier draft of the Local Plan. Its sudden inclusion remains a complete mystery to RPC.

73. The site is largely open rural countryside of both landscape and ecological importance providing a green buffer between the heavily trafficked A3 and the settlement of Burnt Common.

74. The site fully satisfies retention within the Green Belt and serves a number of Green Belt functions and makes an important contribution to local openness.

75. The site is fundamentally unsuitable for housing development and the compromised nature of the site, by constraints such as the presence of high volumes of traffic in close proximity and the large high voltage pylons which cross the site longitudinally, as well as areas of ancient woodland mean that development would either result in substantial harm to the ancient woodland, species and habitat, lead to unacceptable living conditions or would not make best use of land. There is no masterplan to show how the scale of development envisaged would be accommodated.

76. Previous development, with much more limited housing development (up to 25 units) (Planning Reference 14/P/00219 February 2014) on this site has been refused because of the adverse effect on the Green Belt and the rural character of the site. If 25 dwelling units comprised harm to the rural and open character of the site, 400 units must be the cause of very much more substantial harm. In addition, Planning Ref 16/P/00783 Oldlands Field Yard (Outline) 9 dwelling houses April 2016 was also refused on 07/06/2016 because of the impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the significant effect on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and the loss of rural economy.

Non sustainable location

77. The site does not represent sustainable development for several reasons.

78. Firstly the site does not provide a sustainable location, both in respect of access to transport, services and other facilities.

79. Poor access to public transport would mean high dependency on the private motor car for residents’ access to schools, shops, medical facilities, doctors’ surgeries, and all the requirements of day to day living. The size of the site at 400 units would not be capable of sustaining facilities on-site and there are no cycle routes or segregated cycling or walking areas. Clandon Station is 2 miles distance with limited parking, no cycle path and a footpath that changes sides repeatedly. The only bus service is an infrequent rural bus service. No sustainable transport assessment has informed the allocation.

80. The industrial use of the site would also be likely to generate additional traffic and use by car for those employed at the site. There is no evidence of demand for 7000 sq m of new B class uses on such a site.

81. Secondly, in terms of harm to the environment the development of the site would be likely to cause a number of substantial impacts, including harm to ecology, landscape and damage to, or loss of ancient woodland.
82. The late introduction of this allocation means that it has not formed a part of the 2016 Sustainability Assessment and no separate environmental impact assessment has been carried out in respect of the development of the site.

83. The impacts of ecology of the development of 400 units on the site have simply not been assessed and are unknown.

84. No ecological study or assessment appears to have been made.

85. Significant parts of the site are Ancient Woodland and protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Ancient woodland and veteran trees are widely recognised for their importance to biodiversity and as host for protected species.

86. The site is within 400m of the Thames Basin Heath SPA.
87. There is local knowledge of several species of owls, several species of bats, badgers, deer, foxes, red kites, sparrow hawks, invertebrates resorting to the site. It is considered likely that protected mammals, bats and birds are breeding within the site.

Poor living conditions

88. Thirdly, the site is likely to suffer from poor living conditions; in particular noise and air quality impacts from proximity to the A3 and the creation of the new junction with the A3 trunk road under allocation A43a. It is understood that a study is being carried out for the neighbourhood plan, but that exercise has not been completed and did not inform the allocation.

Pylons

89. The site is traversed by large high voltage electricity pylons, which will require a safeguarded zone beneath them where residential development cannot take place. In addition there is mention of the possibility of re-siting these pylons however it remains unclear about the cost implications or who will be funding this.

Flood risk

90. The assessment of flood risk is flawed. Large parts of the central part of the site are high risk (Zones 2&3) and flood annually. The haste with which the site has been allocated means no proper flood risk assessment has been made. Neither the extent, frequency and potential for mitigation or its effect on the developable area have not been considered. Such an assessment should be made before, not after, allocation.

Loss of agricultural land

91. The land is assessed as Grade 2 agricultural land. The agricultural use of the land will be lost if the site is developed for 400 units and 7000sq m of industrial. Loss of the best or most versatile land to development should be avoided.

Deliverability

92. Deliverability is essential to soundness. Astonishingly, no assessment has been made of the potential of the site to deliver the 400 units having regard to the proximity of the A3 and the weight and volume of traffic. The LAA is silent on this matter, not even making a note of the issue.
93. There is no assessment of the viability of development on this site or its deliverability given the range of significant constraints.

94. There is no explanation as to why a potentially suitable site (i.e Land Around Burnt Common Warehouse( B13, the previous 2014 Plan’s A43) was dropped and replaced by this fundamentally unsuitable site for the development of substantial new housing.

Conclusions

95. The allocation of Garlick’s Arch is fundamentally unacceptable in a number of respects and would not constitute sustainable development, contrary to the NPPF. The allocation has not been informed by evidence of its environmental impacts or its suitability for development and this aspect of the SPLP is plainly not sound.

RPC objects to this allocation and recommends a modification to the Plan in that the allocation should be deleted in its entirety.

Policy A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

Areas of land on both sides of the A3 are identified for future highway work in providing slip roads for the A3. The provision of land for slip roads to the A3 in allocation A43a is largely to provide enhanced highway access so as to serve inappropriate large scale housing development elsewhere in the Send/Ripley area; in particular, the sites at A25 Gosden Hill Farm and Site A35 at former Wisley Airfield currently served by the inadequate rural network and including 400 units proposed on the Garlicks Arch site.

96. The slip roads A43a are not in any Highways Programme and their delivery is very uncertain. Highways England have no provision to look at the A3 in any area until at least 2020/2022 and therefore it is unknown whether these slipways will ever be developed. Infrastructure should be in place before development commences.

97. There does not appear to have been any report to the Executive Committee to support this allocation and the LAA 2016 is hopelessly inadequate as an assessment of the environmental impact on the site or as an assessment of its suitability for the development proposed. RPC are concerned that it appears that Members were compelled to make the decision to allocate the site with very little information and without any proper assessment of the constraints of the site or any evidence of its deliverability.

Conclusions

98. RPC objects to this allocation and recommends that the Plan should be modified so that the site should be excluded from the allocations and from development and its current Green Belt status should be retained.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8318  Respondent: 15278465 / Chris Wright  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1685  Respondent: 15284577 / Helen Whiley  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

1. This is permanent Green Belt land and there are no “exceptional circumstances” to change this.
Huge objections from local residents have been ignored by you.

It is absolutely criminal to destroy ancient woodland that is rare and should be cherished not destroyed.

The joining up of Ripley and Send would create a polluted busy corridor and is against Green Belt principles.

It would increase traffic in our area to an unacceptable point.

There are too many houses proposed for this site for the area, roads and infrastructure to support.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1281  **Respondent:** 15284673 / Andrew Bell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I strongly object to late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch due to the following reasons:

There must be no development on designated Greenbelt land. It’s too important to the balance of the local community and the environment. Even a small area will make a big difference to wildlife. It’s what makes this area a pleasant place to live and visit. I object to any insetting of any villages from the Greenbelt.

The development will destroy the character of the surrounding area.

This development will cause more flooding due to the density or the proposed housing.

This development will add to existing local traffic congestion at peak times. There are constant backups and delays with current levels of traffic.

This development will cause more cramped conditions on commuter trains to London, lack of train station parking spaces etc.

The industrial site will add to the hot holes and the poor condition of all local roads.

This development will add to mean more local children will not get a place at their local school. There is no plan to meet secondary school requirements.

This development will put more pressure on the local medical centre in Send.

This development will not provide affordable housing due to their cost and the location is too far from Woking or Guildford where residents are likely to work

This development is poorly thought through and seems to be driven by an attitude of let’s build lots of homes, destroy the local area and make some money! Why not start with the brownfield sites first. How about focussing on the infrastructure first!

Please don’t destroy Ripley and Send.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to Object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because despite the changes:

- It still recommends providing a large amount of new homes, which is always going to have an enormous impact on a local community.
- It will still generate more traffic which will cause more congestion on local roads in and around Send and Ripley.
- The air quality will get worse with the increase in vehicles.
- It still means a greater pressure on, already overstretched, local public services.
- It still does not feel like there is an exceptional circumstance to remove land from the Greenbelt.
- It begs the question, what happened to all the thousands of previous objections?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this...
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/1293</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15285121 / Audrey Boughton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
years old. The proposal includes for Industrial development which could easily be provided at nearby Slyfield Industrial Estate where current infrastructure could be upgraded to cope with such increase.

**LACK OF CONSULTATION** - There are sites in the Draft Local Plan that were not included in the Regulation 18 draft such as Garlicks Arch, Winds Ridge and Send Hill and have **NOT** been considered upon previously. One of the sites is reported to be unsafe by way of land fill waste and is therefore unsuitable for development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1330</th>
<th>Respondent: 15293793 / Anita Norman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY A43 – LAND AT GARLICKS ARCH, SEND MARSH**

The proposal for 400 residential units and 6 travelling showpeople's plots on a Green Belt site is contrary to current policies and ignores the many thousands of objections previously made by local people.

No ‘Special Circumstances’ exist or have been put forward to justify development on this Green Belt site.

The development will put extreme pressure on local roads and when considered with the other nearby proposals for development currently being put forward by the Council in the Draft Local Plan, (both residential and commercial/industrial), will result in gridlock at peak times with the resultant detriment to the quality of life and environment in the area, particularly considering the impact that the proposed North and South slip roads on to the A3 would make by drawing more traffic on to the local road network.

Residential development alongside major highways is known to cause health problems in the very young and old and if this site is developed the long term impact on the residents will in turn put more pressure on local and County Health facilities, particularly if the A3 slip roads abutting one side of the site, (as previously mentioned) are constructed thus increasing traffic flow around the site. The A3 is a major Trunk road that will inevitably become overloaded in the not too distant future given the lack of infrastructure improvements proposed by the Council to cope with the influx of traffic with regard to both proposed imminent and long term development.

The site contains ancient woodlands and should be protected (and enhanced) against development that might impinge upon the quality of the surrounding area and adversely affect the survival of the trees which are regarded as an important amenity for the area and can be seen from distant views.

Garlicks Arch adds to the important Green Barrier that separates the villages of Ripley and Send Marsh and any erosion of this will set precedent and eventually result in the merging of the two villages contrary to National Green Belt policy.

The site is currently designated as within Flood Zone 2/3 and as such development within Flood Plains should be avoided. If development is inevitable then Surface Water mitigation/management must ensure that flood water is properly dealt with and **NOT** directed so as to cause flooding elsewhere on existing developed land.

There is no proven demand to accommodate Travelling Showpeople in this area who, by the very nature of their business, will bring more traffic problems for the Ripley and Send villages when transporting very large vehicles to and from the site, where the visual impact of the vehicles and structures when stored, will be detrimental to the surrounding area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the plan for the Garlick's Arch, for there is not the need for the number of houses proposed, nor the industrial site. It will also mean the closure of the Clay Pigeon Shooting club on land by Kiln Lane, as well as impinging on the attraction of the surrounding area. The club has been there since 1980 and will be unable to relocate, thus removing a facility enjoyed by upward of 100 members and guests.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the inclusion of Garlick's Arch (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it's removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2) - housing need is NOT an exceptional circumstance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick's Arch, despite the preference for previously developed land in the Plan.

The site is not appropriate because:

- It floods regularly
- There is no adequate public transport, and no plans to improve local roads
- GBC do not propose to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope
- It has ancient woodland and is home to many wildlife There is no wildlife report for the site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Garlick’s Arch (A43)
Garlick’s Arch is protected Green Belt land. There are no excuses for removing it from the Green Belt.
The land has no transport infrastructure, it’s liable to flooding and the woodlands (including more than 80 ancient oaks) and the wildlife they support should be preserved for future generations.

Air quality (Policy I3)
I have huge concerns about the air quality/ increased air pollution, which will have an impact on the health of residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch (A43)
Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it's removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have replaced a sustainable brownfield site at Burnt Common with Garlick's Arch.
The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.
• The Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all

Furthermore, no Section 18 consultation took place on this site prior to this site's inclusion in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/1328  Respondent: 15297217 / Elizabeth White  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch and the result such a development would have on local schools and GP surgeries.

I object to the increased traffic that would result from the Garlicks Arch development and the on/off ramp at Burnt Common.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1339  Respondent: 15298017 / Margaret Cousins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1583</td>
<td>15299041 / Elizabeth Teece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>, is Sound? , is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **I OBJECT to the development of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road.** To build on a site that floods and is covered by ancient woodland is beyond belief. The 7000 sq metres of industrial space is not needed. If it is then it should be at Slyfield.

1. **I OBJECT to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch.**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/1373</td>
<td>15299425 / Tim and June Yorath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>, is Sound? , is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

We object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

We have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road land is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham school was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.) The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the
pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1377</th>
<th>Respondent: 15300385 / Mark Harding</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4410  Respondent: 15300385 / Mark Harding  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1322  Respondent: 15301761 / Paul Norman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 – LAND AT GARLICKS ARCH, SEND MARSH

• The proposal for 400 residential units and 6 travelling showpeople plots on a Green Belt site is contrary to current policies and ignores the many thousands of objections previously made by local people.
• No ‘Special Circumstances’ exist or have been put forward to justify development on this Green Belt site.
• The development will put extreme pressure on local roads and when considered with the other nearby proposals for development currently being put forward by the Council in the Draft Local Plan, (both residential and commercial/industrial), will result in gridlock at peak times with the resultant detriment to the quality of life and environment in the area, particularly considering the impact that the proposed North and South slip roads on to the A3 would make by drawing more traffic on to the local road network.
• Residential development alongside major highways is known to cause health problems in the very young and old and if this site is developed the long term impact on the residents will in turn put more pressure on local and County Health facilities, particularly if the A3 slip roads abutting one side of the site, (as previously mentioned) are constructed thus increasing traffic flow around the site. The A3 is a major Trunk road that will inevitably become overloaded in the not too distant future given the lack of infrastructure improvements proposed by the Council to cope with the influx of traffic with regard to both proposed imminent and long term development.
• The site contains ancient woodlands and should be protected (and enhanced) against development that might impinge upon the quality of the surrounding area and adversely affect the survival of the trees which are regarded as an important amenity for the area and can be seen from distant views.
• Garlicks Arch adds to the important Green Barrier that separates the villages of Ripley and Send Marsh and any erosion of this will set precedent and eventually result in the merging of the two villages contrary to National Green Belt policy.
• The site is currently designated as within Flood Zone 2/3 and as such development within Flood Plains should be avoided. If development is inevitable then Surface Water mitigation/management must ensure that flood water is properly dealt with and NOT directed so as to cause flooding elsewhere on existing developed land.
• There is no proven demand to accommodate Travelling Showpeople in this area who, by the very nature of their business, will bring more traffic problems for the Ripley and Send villages when transporting very large vehicles to and from the site, where the visual impact of the vehicles and structures when stored, will be detrimental to the surrounding area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3310  Respondent: 15301953 / A Smithers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch to allow for 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show people plots. This proposal will saturate our village as this number of houses is excessive and will destroy the ancient woodland that has existed for hundreds of years. Guildford Borough Council should be protecting this area. It will join up Ripley and Send villages unnecessarily and will erode the Green Belt and generate excessive traffic, blocking the already gridlocked roads. The area is prone to flooding and this proposal will increase the likelihood of further flooding. There is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area, and ‘no exceptional circumstances’ exist to destroy the Green Belt status of this location. There are others areas in the Borough available for development. This area is already over-burdened, the Doctors surgery and schools are struggling to cope with existing volumes as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2686  Respondent: 15303457 / Hannah Green  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It will cause the village to be 'over-developed' with the consequent impact on local services such as schools and health services which are already stretched
• It will join up the villages of Ripley and Send into one ribbon development and so defeat the key purpose of having a Green Belt
• It is a flood zone 2 area
• It will cause excessive traffic which will increase air pollution and cause congestion

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1395  Respondent: 15304737 / Pamela Orthodoux  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

4). I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh J Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it's removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2).Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1397  Respondent: 15304897 / Richard Baker  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1416  Respondent: 15304929 / Rosemary Wood  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development on this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A2.47 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current 'soft' edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BS). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1779  **Respondent:** 15312577 / Freda Ward  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley - this is of significant concern to me as I live on Send Barns Lane, the traffic is already heavy and can also be very fast.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1406  **Respondent:** 15312769 / Norah Johnson  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

---

**Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)**

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

I am objecting on the following points:

1. **I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are **no exceptional circumstances** which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is **not** an exceptional circumstance. The inclusion of this site was added to the Local Plan at the last minute without any consultation or notification to the local residents and as a homeowner in the road that runs alongside this development the local infrastructure, air quality and ancient woodland the site would destroy have all been disregarded.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. No consultation took place on this, and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure – the roads around the site, apart from the main road are little more than country lanes, at points only one car wide, as soon as the main road backs up, which it does at peak times, cars (including myself) head for the lanes and these will become impassable.

• The site is liable to frequent flooding, every time it rains the Portsmouth Road opposite the site floods despite improvements. At the end of Burnt Common Lane the gas mains becomes flooded regularly and this effects the entire road – check this with the Gas Board who have to pump it out.

• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan, Kites, deer and many other species are found on this site.

• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope – it almost impossible to get an appointment at the local surger as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1408  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that the site at Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Farm are traversed by electricity pylons.

“A UK study of 29 000 cases of childhood cancer, including 9700 cases of leukaemia, found a raised risk of childhood leukaemia in children who lived within 200 m of high voltage lines at birth compared with those who lived beyond 600m (relative risk 1.7)

There was also a slightly increased risk for those living 200-600 m from the lines at birth (relative risk 1.2, P for trend < 0.01); as this is further than can readily be explained by magnetic fields it may be due to other aetiological factors associated with power lines.”


I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3249  Respondent: 15312769 / Norah Johnson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch.

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch.
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”

The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1410  Respondent: 15312961 / Alison Johnson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Objections to Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016)

I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).

I am objecting on the following points:

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances, which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance. The inclusion of this site was added to the Local Plan at the last minute without any consultation or notification to the local residents and as a homeowner in the road that runs alongside this development the local infrastructure, air quality and ancient woodland the site would destroy have all been disregarded.
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. No consultation took place on this, and GBC’s Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure – the roads around the site, apart from the main road are little more than country lanes, at points only one car wide, as soon as the main road backs up, which it does at peak times, cars (including myself) head for the lanes and these will become impassable.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding, every time it rains the Portsmouth Road opposite the site floods despite improvements. At the end of Burnt Common Lane the gas mains becomes flooded regularly and this effects the entire road – check this with the Gas Board who have to pump it out.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan, Kites, deer and many other species are found on this site.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope – it almost impossible to get an appointment at the local surgery as it is.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the amendments to the Local Plan policy A43 changes at Garlick's Arch.

You have totally ignored the 32,000 comments made by the local people and are not representing the wishes of the electorate that put you in office.

You have included provision for travelling show people where no demand has been made at this location.

This is an area of ancient woodland included in the Green Belt and you have shown no 'exceptional circumstances' to build on this area.

To put 400 homes in such a small area is excessive and will join Ripley, Burnt Common and Send together which will take away the character of the villages around Guildford which is a feature of this area.

This area, especially where it joins onto the Portsmouth Road is liable to flooding and it has effected the gas main several times on the corner with Burnt Common Lane and further built development will make this problem worse as there will be less ground to soak up the rain, and is currently a zone 2 allocation.

The fields at Garlick's Arch are contaminated with years of lead shot.

The traffic situation in the area id already at capacity at certain times of day and when there are traffic problems on the A3 and M25 and adding thousands of cars in this area will only cause gridlock.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1418  Respondent: 15313921 / Nicky, Chris and Thomas Wilson  Agent:
1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1430  Respondent: 15315233 / Andree Grimshaw  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43. I OBJECT to Garlick's Arch being built on.

This is greenbelt land and will be completely destroyed if there are 400 houses and industrial and warehousing developments built there. There is no exceptional circumstances to build on this land. There is no need for industrial developments in Send, build at Slyfield where one already exists. Trees cannot be replaced quickly and act a noise barrier to the A3. There is also not enough Secondary Schools in the area to cater for that many extra people. Additionally, there are no buses or trains to prevent anybody locally having a car at commuting times, you cannot even get back from Woking Station long after 7pm!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2147  Respondent: 15320673 / Rosie Beauvais  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch for the following:

The proposal to build 400 new homes will result in excessive traffic throughout the Send & Ripley roads which are already overcrowded. The residents of these 400 homes will require amenities in the local area such as doctors & dentists surgery which are currently struggling to keep up with current demand. A doctors appointment can take up to a week to secure.

The proposal for travelling showpeople plots has increased since the last plans and there is no evidence any plots are required in the Send area.

The Green Belt and woodland around Garlicks Arch is irreplaceable, loss of it will result in the joining up of the villages of Ripley & Send defeating one of the key purposes of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/3536  Respondent: 15320737 / Steven Brown  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch - now 400 homes and 6 travelling showpeople plots

There is no proof of the need for Travelling Show people plots in this location. The Village of Send is on Green Belt Land and therefore should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. This development stops the green belt achieving one of its purposes to prevent urban sprawl and the increase in houses would represent over-development of our villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1577  Respondent: 15321217 / Sally Rule  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlicks arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and where are the plans to improve local schools, public transport and medical facilities?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1456  Respondent: 15323841 / Claire Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1471  Respondent: 15324833 / Ann Gifford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. It was a very late addition to the Local Plan and a big surprise. In addition to being in the Green Belt the area has flooded in the past and is covered by ancient woodland. The roads in the area of Send and Ripley are already very busy and vary from slow to gridlock at peak times. Adding a large number of homes and businesses will aggravate this situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2383  Respondent: 15324833 / Ann Gifford  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It will result in Send, a small village, becoming overdeveloped.

Too many new houses for the current infrastructure to cope with.

The local roads in Send and Ripley are extremely busy with commuter traffic everyday and wouldn't be able to cope with all the extra cars etc.

The area is subject to flooding so not suitable for further development.

An area of ancient woodland, part of the Green Belt, would be destroyed for an unnecessary development.

Very few travelling shows come to this area so I can't see a need to accommodate them

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1484  Respondent: 15326273 / John Haslam  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1485  Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT

POLICY A 43

. 30 ha LAND AT GARLICK'S ARCH, Burnt Common, designated for 400 houses and 7,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the borough. This site is NEW and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted upon previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2044  Respondent: 15326369 / J D W Todd  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.

400 homes and 6 Travelling Show people plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:

1) It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

2) There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location

3) It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist

4) It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

5) It is ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
6) It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

7) It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation

8) It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years

9) it will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley where parking is almost impossible at many times of the day

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1493  Respondent: 15326401 / Claire Haslam  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1492  Respondent: 15326465 / James Parker  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
b. Garlic’s Arch and Burnt Common Interchange (site nos. A43 and A43a)

1. **Outside current development boundary**: I OBJECT since this development lies outside the existing housing outline of the village, and should therefore be deleted to avoid both loss of green belt land and creeping development between Send, Woking, and Guildford.
2. **Traffic Infrastructure Capacity**: I OBJECT to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common since this would generate significant new traffic movements that surrounding roads cannot accommodate.
3. **Traffic Infrastructure Evidence**: I further OBJECT to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common since associated transport evidence is incomplete and does not justify additional A3 access at this location.
4. **General Infrastructure**: I OBJECT to development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the development, including utilities, social amenities, schooling, public transport, and medical facilities.
5. **Industrial use**: I OBJECT to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is not a sustainable development. It is removed from the major population centres in Guildford and Woking necessitating a large increase in public transport services and/or major additional traffic movements for staff travel and business logistics. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space within the Borough it should be located at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available and where it would be largely welcomed.
6. **Flooding**: I OBJECT to development at Garlick’s Arch. This area is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher flood risk area than the Council’s own assessment and has flooded many times in recent years. Therefore the Council’s own assessment is invalid and the site must not be developed.
7. **Environment**: I OBJECT to the destruction of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• **Traffic Infrastructure Capacity:** I **OBJECT** to the proposed development because this would generate significant new traffic movements that surrounding roads cannot accommodate.

• **Flooding:** I **OBJECT** to development at Garlick’s Arch because the area is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher flood risk area (zone 2) than the Council’s own assessment and has flooded many times in recent years. Therefore the Council’s own assessment is invalid and the site must not be developed.

• **Environment:** I **OBJECT** to the destruction of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1497  **Respondent:** 15326785 / James Hampton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5443  **Respondent:** 15326817 / Peter Jennings-Giles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that the first notification I received of the proposed changes to include development of Garlicks Arch was as in early June via a leaflet distributed by a concerned neighbour and not via Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED. I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1500  **Respondent:** 15327137 / Sally Edwards  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1501  Respondent: 15327201 / Sam Philips  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1502  Respondent: 15327521 / Dion Slattery-Hill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1509  Respondent: 15327681 / Lukesz Romoszewslai  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1521</th>
<th>Respondent: 15327873 / Susan Richards</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1525</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328161 / Louise Midgley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1526</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328481 / Millie Midgley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1529</th>
<th>Respondent: 15328865 / R.A. Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1533  Respondent: 15328993 / B. Joseph  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1532  Respondent: 15329345 / Robin Hurst  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy 43. Land at Garlicks Arch.

There is no proven need for additional 400 new houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough.

The Surgery at Send cannot cope, the local schools cannot cope. The entire plan is ill conceived.

Summary.

Your plans have blighted my family home for years, the plan originally put a development at the back of my house, and now your new plans have changed it to the development at the front of my family home. Therefore having a huge detrimental effect on the value, and destroying our views of the farmland at the front. Therefore your poorly thought through local plan have provided uncertainty and anxiety to myself and my family.

As no speed restrictions, speed camera or traffic calming measures on the blind corner heading towards Send over the A3 is an accident waiting to happen. As it is we can only turn left when leaving our home and even then it is very dangerous.

You have not addressed the infrastructure requirements such as schools, health centres and hospital capacity, in these proposals, for new homes.

Therefore this plan needs to be thought through and new alternative proposals need to be looked at.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** pslp172/2292  **Respondent:** 15329345 / Robin Hurst  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43. Land at Garlicks Arch.  

- There is no proven need for additional 400 new houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed by the borough.  
- The Health Surgery at send cannot cope, the local schools cannot cope. The entire plan is ill conceived.  
- It continues to ignore tens of thousands of previous objections.  
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location.  
- There are no “exceptional circumstances” exist for removing this site from the greenbelt.  
- The land is subject to frequent flooding and is currently flood Zone 2 allocation.  
- It will join the villages of Send and Ripley and defeat one of the intended purposes of the greenbelt.  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1536  **Respondent:** 15329409 / Emma Wicks  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/1534  **Respondent:** 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford  **Agent:**  
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

RE: OBJECTION to Guildford Borough Council 2016 Revised Draft Local Plan  

I am writing to object to the revised draft 2016 Local Plan for the reasons listed below:  

1. I OBJECT to Policy A43 Garlick's Arch as this was a late substitution for an alternative site known as Land at Burnt Common (also included in the 2014 Draft Local Plan). There was no consultation on this substitution, following an emergency meeting of the Executive on 11th May 2016. This does not comply with Regulation 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 relating to the Statement of Community Involvement, as
there has not been any community information or consultation regarding Garlick's Arch site. In addition, this site substitution also remained as the same policy number ie A43, which has led to further confusion within the local community. The original Policy A43 site of brownfield land at Burnt Common is already designated as industrial and indeed the owners of this site have already spent at least two years developing planning proposals with GBC to include 100 homes in addition to a fully developed industrial site, with ample space to accommodate at least an additional 7000 sq m. The Garlick's Arch site however is not suitable for development given that it is designated as Green Belt (policy P2). The Local Plan clearly states a preference for best utilising previously developed land. Why then has a brownfield site been removed and replaced with a Greenbelt site?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3513  Respondent: 15329441 / Suzie Powell-Cullingford  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to Policy A43 Garlick's Arch as this was a late substitution for an alternative site known as Land at Burnt Common (also included in the 2014 Draft Local Plan). There was no consultation on this substitution, following an emergency meeting of the Executive on 11th May 2016. This does not comply with Regulation 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 relating to the Statement of Community Involvement, as there has not been any community information or consultation regarding Garlick's Arch site. In addition, this site substitution also remained as the same policy number ie A43, which has led to further confusion within the local community. The original A43 site of brownfield land at Burn Common is already designated as industrial and indeed the owners of this site have already spent at least two years developing planning proposals with GBC to include 100 homes in addition to a fully developed industrial site, with ample space to accommodate at least an additional 7000 sq m.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1538  Respondent: 15329537 / J Sweby  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development at Garlick's Arch. The destruction of ancient woodland will still result in unacceptable levels in the increase of noise and pollution to the residents of Send marsh and Burnt common. It is also an important habitat for declining numbers of hedgehogs and thrushes and the wild life.

I object to the number of houses and industrial units at Garlicks Arch. I question the need for those houses in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1537  Respondent: 15329569 / P.J Kirkwood  Agent:  

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1554  Respondent: 15331681 / Anne Lowndes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an after thought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1557  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which is protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/4708  Respondent: 15340929 / Claire Smylie  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1597  Respondent: 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43/A43a - I strongly object to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common as this would generate a huge volume of traffic through the village. It is already congested during rush hours especially with the school on Send Barnes Road. When the northbound lanes of the A3 are congested both in the morning and evening rush hours (which is most weekdays) Send Village is totally congested and then many local drivers speed down country lanes (Potters Lane) to avoid Send Road/Send Barnes Road and drive dangerously. Additional traffic will only exaggerate the situation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1603  Respondent: 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Additional housing at Garlick's Arch will exasperate and add to the local chaos on the roads and the already stretched amenities. I therefore strongly object to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial is not needed as there are many offices and warehouses sitting idle in the local area. Fill these sites first before developing more empty units. Any new industrial units should be built at Slyfield where there is already an established site and the rods can cope with the traffic. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

In addition to the other proposals, I object to Policy A42, 45 houses proposed to be built in Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is a country, single access and the staggered cross roads- junction with Send Road is already dangerous, especially due peak times. This will just add to the growing congestion in Send. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the marina, both of which will generate additional traffic (large vehicles for boats etc) The lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3263  Respondent: 15341441 / Gillian Thorpe  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

there is no proven need to supply Pit he's for travelling show people. This is a green belt area which separates two villages. Building on flooded areas, contaminated by lead is not an ideal place for building. As a home owner, I would not wish to purchase a dwelling on such land as it would pose an insurance problem. Again, Send and Ripley cannot operate an excessive new dwellings. The roads and entities would suffer.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1622  Respondent: 15341985 / William Walker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlick's Arch, Opposite Send Marsh Road. This is an area of Ancient woodland and very prone to flooding indeed recently over half a million pounds was spent downstream of this location to prevent flooding to houses in Maples Road and surrounding area's. The Industrial space is not needed but could however already be accommodated at Slyfield Park in nearby Guildford. Guildford Boroughs housing requirements have been shown to be grossly over exaggerated, and they refuse to disclose what formula they use to arrive at their calculated requirements. Proper use of Brownfield sites within the Borough should eliminate the need to encroach on such a Green Belts area!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1551  Respondent: 15341985 / William Walker  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people. It will cause extensive over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will generate more traffic which will not only block up the local roads of Send and Ripley, but also the major A3 trunk road into Guildford which already struggles to cope with current traffic levels during rush hour periods.

It is also a flood zone 2 allocated area, and subject to frequent flooding. There is also no proven demand for Travelling Show-people plots in this location.
I OBJECT to the location for new employment floor space at Garlick's Arch:

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class 81c, 82 and 88) floor space will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floor space to be located at Garlick's Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance its impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that, with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1636  Respondent: 15342465 / Evelyn Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlick's Arch, Opposite Send Marsh Road. This is an area of Ancient woodland and very prone to flooding indeed recently over half a million pounds was spent downstream of this location to prevent flooding to houses in Maples Road and surrounding area's. The Industrial space is not needed but could however already be accommodated at Slyfield Park in nearby Guildford. Guildford Boroughs housing requirements have been shown to be grossly over exaggerated, and they refuse to disclose what formula they use to arrive at their calculated requirements. Proper use of Brownfield sites within the Borough should eliminate the need to encroach on such a Green Belts area!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1595  Respondent: 15342465 / Evelyn Walker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people. It will cause extensive over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will generate more traffic which will not only block up the local roads of Send and Ripley, but also the major A3 trunk road into Guildford which already struggles to cope with current traffic levels during rush hour periods. It is also a flood zone 2 allocated area, and subject to frequent flooding. There is also no proven demand for Travelling Show-people plots in this location.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1645</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15342529 / Lesley Peed</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. There is already great pressure on local school and medical provision and this can only worsen. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1648</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15342657 / Ann Cameron</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inadequate notification and planning for Developments 43 and 43a

The developments on Land a Garlick’s Arch were not included in the Draft Local Plan 2014, and it is only in the Draft Local Plan 2016 that I first learnt of them. Therefore, I object because it is unfair to make such a major change to the Plan with so little prior notification, and allow such a short consultation period of only 6 weeks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1650</th>
<th><strong>Respondent:</strong> 15342753 / Mike Milne</th>
<th><strong>Agent:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to policy A43

The land at Garlicks Arch is covered in ancient woodland with some of the trees dating back as far as the sixteenth century.

The wildlife and fauna is prolific in this area and it is a major part of the green belt which must be protected.

This area also allows for natural drainage of surface water.
The National Planning Policy Framework prevents the merging of settlements and if this development was allowed then it would contravene that policy.

The infrastructure is not in place to accept such an increase in traffic.

The local area is already at breaking point at peak periods and this development would virtually bring the area to a standstill at peak times.

The doctors surgery could not take all of the predicted numbers of new people moving into the area.

The local schools would be in the same position as the doctors surgery, with more people than it could cope with.

Guildford Council have just refused planning permission for nine dwellings on Oldlands Field Yard, planning application number 16/P/00783, which is part of the Garlick's Arch site. All of the reasons for refusal given by the council for this development must surely then apply to the whole of the Garlic's Arch area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1666  Respondent: 15343713 / Sara Frohmader  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the building at Garlick's Arch which is covered in ancient woodland. This land should be protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements.

I also object to the slip roads at Burnt common as the A247 is already a very busy road and dangerous to cross. It would cause a 'rat-run' through send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1667  Respondent: 15343745 / Stephanie Harris  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 & A43a - Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley  

I object to the housing and industrial developments proposed under policies A43 and A43a. The existing road infrastructure, local medical centre, school and shops would be completely overwhelmed. The new slip roads and junction would funnel traffic to Woking, it would become a complete bottleneck - thereby raising a completely new problem. The lovely countryside feel of the area would be lost. Please consider developing brownfield sites as part of industrial development.
I am also questioning the process under which Guildford Borough Council are consulting. These are new developments and therefore should be subject to a full consultation under Regulation 18. Consulting via Regulation 19 in this manner feel like a cheat.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1678  Respondent: 15344641 / Ann Court  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and an Industrial space at Garlick Arch.

This site in particular is covered with woodland and pasture and certainly never intended for building purposes.

The site floods dreadfully, water coming off the A 3 into the stream which then floods the fields.

We have photographic proof of this as it is Cobham Sporting Gun Club site and has been for the best part of 30 years and floods often.

The Industrial proposal should be sited at Slyfield which would be ideal to extend and keep in one place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1720  Respondent: 15345281 / Alexandra Murphy  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.
There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1723  Respondent: 15346817 / Valerie Mead  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A43 Garlicks Arch proposal. We bought our house in a Green Belt area because it WAS in a Green Belt area.
I object to the A43 Garlicks Arch proposal as additional housing would mean reliance on our local Surgery which is already pressurised.

I object to the Garlicks Arch proposal also as apart from additional traffic described above, additional housing would apply more pressure to local schools.

The well being of the local Villagers of Send and Ripley must be considered.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1753  Respondent: 15348033 / Peter Nicholas  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan, it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states a preference is for making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at such a late stage, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1777</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT TO – the late addition of Garlicks Arch Site A43. The Plan should develop the existing <strong>brownfield</strong> site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3993</th>
<th>Respondent: 15348481 / Donna Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1805</th>
<th>Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aplet</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6514  **Respondent:** 15349281 / Steve Aptel  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT in the strongest possible terms to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016). This Plan is unsustainable, unworkable and, in many provisions, unnecessary.

I set out below my objection to specific policies and matters within the Plan. Please ensure that I receive written confirmation that you have received this correspondence by emailing me your acknowledgement.

Please also ensure that my objections are seen by the relevant Planning Inspector.

I have itemised my objections below but also wish to support some of my points by recalling personal experience and other observations (A-C)

1. **FLOODING:** The Garlick's Arch area is a catchment area for The East Clandon. This stream poses a significant flood risk to parts of Send Marsh, especially when there is heavy rainfall in a short time period. Any development of the Garlick's Arch area will significantly increase the rate of "run off" and this is likely to overwhelm the capacity of the stream though Send Marsh.
2. Increased traffic congestion: Traffic levels in the area are already high. The road infrastructure cannot cope with more. This is highlighted when there is a problem on the A3 or M25. Traffic diverts through the Ripley / Burnt Common area and there is gridlock.

I respectfully remind Guildford Borough Council that it has a duty of care to residents and this must be taken into consideration when evaluating the impact of traffic in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6519  Respondent: 15349281 / Steve Aptel  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1821</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350081 / Tania Parslow</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondly, I object to building 400 houses and 7000m² of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. This is in an area prone to flooding and has established woodland. More efficient use of brownfield sites within Guildford is vastly preferable to this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1839</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350689 / Brian Peed</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. There is already great pressure on local school and medical provision and this can only worsen. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt is not needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/1848</th>
<th>Respondent: 15350881 / Mark Hewson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to take this opportunity to register my objection to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to Send Village being removed from the Green Belt status as I feel it is very important to retain the beauty of our countryside. The south east of England will become a concrete jungle if we don't take steps now to protect our ancient woodland and green space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the already heavily congested local roads being subjected to further traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the proposal for a new interchange to the A3 at Burnt Common which will result in further increase in traffic volumes through Send. The A3 is already subject to daily gridlock from high traffic volumes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope the Council will decide the green belt can be respected so that it can continue to be enjoyed by future generations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: pslp172/2908  
**Respondent:** 15350881 / Mark Hewson  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy 43 addition of 8 travelling/showpeople pitches as this will involve destruction of the green belt without any “exceptional circumstances” existing. Will also place additional traffic to the villages of Send and Ripley which are already heavily congested.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1855  
**Respondent:** 15351873 / Magaret Winborn  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO the site A43 Garlicks Arch included at later stage.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1874  
**Respondent:** 15353089 / Alison Tecce  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This area is known to flood. It is part of the Green Belt and is covered by ancient woodland. With proper use of brownfield sites, this Green Belt site is not needed. It would also add additional traffic to the Portsmouth Road and through both Ripley and Send. The local area does not have capacity at the doctors surgery or at the local primary schools. There is already huge concerns by current local residents about the lack of secondary school places for this area, to which this would add increased demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1884  
**Respondent:** 15353633 / Neal Stone  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This area is known to flood. It is part of the Green Belt and is covered by ancient woodland. With proper use of brownfield sites, this Green Belt site is not needed. It would also add additional traffic to the Portsmouth Road and through both Ripley and Send. The local area does not have capacity at the doctors surgery or at the local primary schools. There is already huge concerns by current local residents about the lack of secondary school places for this area, to which this would add increased demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

10. I OBJECT to Policy A43: Garlick’s Arch etc. site which is massively out of proportion and will add tremendous burden onto all local services.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1364  Respondent:  15355361 / Jennifer Brockless  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The proposed minimum of 400 houses to be built, coupled with the sites for "Travelling Show People" (why do they need permanent sites if they are "Travelling"?), and storage, is a development far too large for the area. The houses will be on Green Belt Land and result in a huge conurbation when coupled with the proposed development of Wisley Airfield. The roads in this area are already greatly overcrowded, with often poor air quality as a result. It will also involve the destruction of woodland full of glorious oaks which are a haven for wildlife.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1935  Respondent:  15356385 / Mervyn Plumtree  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1939  Respondent:  15356513 / Anthony Gatford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

2. I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of Industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, Opposite Send Marsh Road. This is an area of Ancient woodland and very prone to flooding indeed recently over half a million pounds was spent downstream of this location to prevent flooding to houses in Maples Road and surrounding area’s. The Industrial space is not needed but could however already be accommodated at Slyfield Park in nearby Guildford. Guildford Borough’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly over exaggerated, and they refuse to disclose what
formula they use to arrive at their calculated requirements. Proper use of Brownfield sites within the Borough should eliminate the need to encroach on such a Green Belt area!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2692  **Respondent:** 15356513 / Anthony Gatford  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

2) I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because: It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people. It will cause extensive over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive. It will generate more traffic which will not only block up the local roads of Send and Ripley, but also the major P3 trunk road into Guildford which already struggles to cope with current traffic levels during rush hour periods. It is also a flood zone 2 allocated area, and subject to frequent flooding. There is also no proven demand for Travelling Show-people plots in this location.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLP16/1951  **Respondent:** 15356801 / Clare Harlow  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

14. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1955  
**Respondent:** 15357217 / Camilla Cressy  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I'm writing to Object profusely about the proposed building plans in and around Send and Ripley.

I'm horrified to learn that you may be removing send village from the green belt and introducing 400 new homes at Garlicks Arch, plus 40 homes in send hill and travellers pitches! I object to all of these changes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1961  
**Respondent:** 15357441 / Richard Hunt  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. When I first heard this I thought it was a mistake. Its a whole new village in one go. Has anybody there been here in rush hour? The industrial space should belong at Slyfield if we ever needed any more.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1966  
**Respondent:** 15357697 / Ros Reeves  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of the Garlick's Arch site A43 opposite the Send Marsh Road. This is a Green Belt site with ancient woodland and is prone to flooding. The planned 7000 sq metres of industrial site is not suitable and if required should be sited at Slyfield where there is already adequate space for such warehousing. Also the requirement of 400 houses on this site is based on dubious calculations which Guildford Council have refused to disclose. With proper use of Brownfield sites in and around Guildford, this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1991  
**Respondent:** 15358305 / Frances Hodgson  
**Agent:**
1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/1993  Respondent: 15358305 / Frances Hodgson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2006  Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object most strongly to the plan to build 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial spaces at Garlick’s Arch. As well as threatening ancient woodland, this proposal destroys the green swathe of land which is all that separates Send Marsh
(where I live) from the traffic and pollution of the A3. The implications of the infrastructure of roads and local services (the Medical Centre and schools for example) are unsupportable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1070  Respondent: 15358625 / Ron Best  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 which adds 8 travelling showpeople patches to the Green swathe between Send Marsh and the A3 ('Garlick's Arch'). These cannot be in-keeping with the housing development proposed, and there is no known demand for this amenity.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2042  Respondent: 15359905 / John Burns  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Moving back to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch (A43) where a mix of residential and Industrial buildings are placed within the GB, I object to this. Why was the perfectly acceptable BF site at Burnt Common removed from the Plan, late on. There is no evidence that the proper procedure and consultation has been carried out due to the apparent haste in which the action took place. Sec. 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the LA. to consult and involve the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2033  Respondent: 15366209 / Corinne Singleton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh
I object to the A43 changes at Garlick's Arch as follows:
1. You have completely ignored the thousands of previous objections made by local people
2. Why should there be a plot for Travelling Show people in this location when there is no proven demand for this? These people lead a transient lifestyle and therefore there is no need to provide them with a plot of land.
3. You have not provided nor can you justify your reasons for proposing to build on the beautiful permanent Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to allow you to do this.
4. Your proposals will mean our village is 'over developed' and the number of homes excessive.
5. We have beautiful and exquisite ancient woodland that have existed since the time of Elizabeth 1, why do you want to destroy this?
6. These changes will join up Ripley and Send and completely defeat the purpose of the Green Belt
7. This area is subject to flooding and is currently in flood zone 2 and it is contaminated with lead shot which has built up over the last 50 years
8. It will generate more traffic that will cause chaos in the local roads of Ripley and Send

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2800  
Respondent: 15366721 / Sylvia Newton  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 I object. Revised proposal on the grounds of absolutely no infrastructure to support development. Services in Send already saturated. Schools – Dr Surgery –

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2131  
Respondent: 15367361 / Greg Ganjou  
Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of
this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding
would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being
unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the
pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge
concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which
forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and
make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current
“soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c),
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the
removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly
acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a
Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so
there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services
in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to
offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There
are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders
(Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the
woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The
development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The
Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services
such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any
residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2142  **Respondent:** 15368129 / Sharon Cork  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4666  Respondent:  15368993 / Tessa Spink  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2164  Respondent: 15370529 / J Wells  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space being built at Garlick's

This will create frequent gridlock due to the extra vehicles. Also when there is a problem/crash or excessive rainfall the Ripley Bypass is often closed and traffic is sent through Send and Ripley - creating miles of traffic queues in all directions. The pointless destruction of ancient woodlands would make the pollution in this area far greater than the problems that already exist. The accurate calculations for housing have not been released, therefore this is unjustifiable and unacceptable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2192</th>
<th>Respondent: 15371809 / Susan Pengilly</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A43 Garlicks Arch - site of ancient woodland dating to 16th century important wildlife area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to site A43a - on and off ramp at Clandon - local roads are already choked with &quot;cut through&quot; traffic. The local roads and infra-structure cannot cope with more traffic, and a junction here would also encourage heavy good vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6558  Respondent: 15371809 / Susan Pengilly  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metre of industrial space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. This site floods and is covered by ancient woodlands. The industrial space here is not needed, and would be better sited at Slyfield. Woodland should be protected and conserved - once gone it cannot be reclaimed - there are better brown field sites that could used.

There is heavy traffic already on local roads as rushhour traffic tries to find "cut throughs". Our Roads cannot cope with such an increase in population, this will result in infrastructure overload

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2197  Respondent: 15372417 / P. Mew  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

13.  I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (82) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultat ion in relation to

the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
• I object to the proposed new interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common because the Transport Evidence is incomplete and unreliable and shows there will be congestion because Send would be used as a cut through to the A3/ M25.
• I object to the fact that infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with proposed housing Roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2223  Respondent: 15377793 / Robin Dabbs  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GARLICKS ARCH NOT INCLUDED IN REG.18 DRAFT, PERMANENTLY PROTECTED AS GREEN BELT BY NPPF PUBLIC CONSERVATION OF ANCIENT C16 WOODLAND. WOULD SUGGEST IF 7000sqm INDUSTRIAL SPACE IS NEEDED BUILD IT ON THE BROWNFIELD SITE AT SLYFIELD

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2224  Respondent: 15377825 / Christopher Dabbs  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO NEW DEVELOPMENT SITE AT GARLICKS ARCH NOT INCLUDED IN REG.18 DRAFT, PERMANENTLY PROTECTED AS GREEN BELT BY NPPF PUBLIC CONSERVATION OF ANCIENT C16 WOODLAND. WOULD SUGGEST IF 7000sqm INDUSTRIAL SPACE IS NEEDED BUILD IT ON THE BROWNFIELD SITE AT SLYFIELD

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2243  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attended documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4744  Respondent: 15379969 / Teresa Britton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

>> 1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

>> 2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

>> 3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

>> 4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

>> 5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
21. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement-often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2320  Respondent: 15385281 / Daniel Tarrant  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. Send Marsh/Burnt Common/Ripley

To the building of 400 houses on this site, Because it was not include in the regulation 18 draft and has not been previously consulted upon.

It is on Green belt, permanently protected by NPPF to prevent the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances to take this site out of the Green Belt.
The site is covered in Ancient Woodlands, containing trees that have stood since the 16th Century, this area must be conserved for future generations.

I object Policy A43 cont… to the Warehousing and Industrial units which are included in the Policy.

Employment Lands Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 shows an 80% reduction from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013 for employment space.

If Industrial and Warehousing units are required, I question why the Cassidy Slyfield Ltd. North Slyfield site, allocated in 2014 By Guildford Council for Industrial and Warehouse use, was withdrawn from the Local Plan recently.

Surely expanding an existing Brown field industrial area is better than creating a new one on Green Belt Land!

Also heavy traffic would be attracted to Garlick’s Arch site from the M25 and A3, a lot of it using the A247, which is not suited to this traffic!

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a humpbacked bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and recross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.20.POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4357  Respondent: 15386017 / Gareth Sinnett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2354  Respondent: 15386337 / Edna Slater  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory
purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2356  Respondent: 15388385 / Linda Bagnall  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2358  Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is covered in ancient woodland and is within the Green Belt and should stay that way. 16th century trees would be endangered. This area is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan so this is not required. Any industrial development needed should be built Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3392  Respondent: 15388641 / Eva Hay  Agent:

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is covered in ancient woodland and is within the Green Belt and should stay that way. 16th century trees would be endangered. This area is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. The latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan so this is not required. Any industrial development needed should be built Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.
3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever by regained.
4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.
6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.
7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.
8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4422</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15388673 / Bruce Stewart</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be
dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of
development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be
provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion.
Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the
environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there
to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt
is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the
neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley
will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on
the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100
or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been
assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of
river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.
18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.
19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.
22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick's Arch should be protected from development as previously undeveloped Green Belt. This site is over 100 acres of grade 2 agricultural land surrounded by designated ancient woodland and traversed by a stream flowing into the River Wey. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Local Plan states their preference is for the use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a current industrial brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick's Arch. This late substitution on 11th May 3016 with no prior consultation with the local community is in direct contravention of NPPF. In addition, I object to the allocation of the same policy site number A43 for both sites ie the removed site A43 “the land at Burnt Common” and the substituted site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is not acceptable and suggests a degree of duplicity by GBC and not being fully open and transparent in this substitution.

One wonders also if the “gifting” of the land and financial provision for the construction of the A43a ramps at a suggested cost of £20million paid for by the owner/developer of Garlicks Arch (all of which has been publicly confirmed by Cllr Paul Spooner and Cllr Matt Furniss and recommended by them both as a good thing) is one of the key factors in the decision to substitute in Garlick’s Arch as site A43? It appears that this site is being heavily promoted by GBC as an enabling facility for site A25 Gosden Hill. This is completely unacceptable and I object in the strongest terms.

The sites A43 and A43a are not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan. There is substantial anecdotal evidence from local residents of the existence of significant numbers of wildlife at Garlicks Arch who utilise this land as a wildlife corridor in between Send and Ripley. There are bats, owls, deer, badgers, red kites, and many other species of flora and fauna.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical facilities or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3582</th>
<th>Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the late substitution and inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (site A43)

Garlick's Arch should be protected from development as previously undeveloped Green Belt. This site is over 100 acres of grade 2 agricultural land surrounded by designated ancient woodland and traversed by a stream flowing into the River Wey. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Local Plan states their preference is for the use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a current industrial brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch. This late substitution on 11th May 3016 with no prior consultation with the local community is in direct contravention of NPPF. In addition, I object to the allocation of the same policy site number A43 for both sites ie the removed site A43 “the land at Burnt Common” and the substituted site A43 Garlick’s Arch. This is not acceptable and suggests a degree of duplicity by GBC and not being fully open and transparent in this substitution.

One wonders also if the "gifting" of the land and financial provision for the construction of the A43a ramps at a suggested cost of £20million paid for by the owner/developer of Garlicks Arch <all of which has been publicly confined by Cllr
Paul Spooner and Cllr Matt Furniss and recommended by them both as a good thing) is one of the key factors in the decision to substitute in Garlick's Arch as site A43? It appears that this site is being heavily promoted by GBC as an enabling facility for site A25 Gosden Hill. This is completely unacceptable and I object in the strongest terms.

The sites A43 and A43a are not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.

- The site is liable to frequent flooding.

- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan. There is substantial anecdotal evidence from local residents of the existence of significant numbers of wildlife at Garlicks Arch who utilise this land as a wildlife corridor in between Send and Ripley. There are bats, owls, deer, badgers, red kites, and many other species of flora and fauna.

- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical facilities or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3632  Respondent: 15388865 / Andrew Powell-Cullingford  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no requirement for a new industrial site at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7000 sq m proposed, That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoned argument or consultation.

Furthermore the development at Garlick's Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been on site for many decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable. These businesses do not wish to relocate to new premises.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2368  Respondent: 15389025 / Keith Cogan  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch A43 and A43a

As previously stated I believe the A247 through old woking cannot cope with current levels of traffic never mind more. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. I don’t believe more houses are required here in a green belt area. I object to the proposed industrial
The development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding!

I have objected to many of these proposals before. I hope the council are listening this time and we don’t have to do this all over again. I object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals which destroy our green belt and urge the council to redevelop within urban areas and brownfield sites. I know these are less attractive to developers but so be it. We owe it to our children and future generations to protect our countryside and honour the trust that has been placed in us to do that.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2666  
**Respondent:** 15389025 / Keith Cogan  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As previously stated I believe the A247 through old woking cannot cope with current levels of traffic never mind more. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough. I don’t believe more houses are required here in a green belt area. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding!

I have objected to many of these proposals before. I hope the council are listening this time and we don’t have to do this all over again. I object in the strongest possible terms to these proposals which destroy our green belt and urge the council to redevelop within urban areas and brownfield sites. I know these are less attractive to developers but so be it. We owe it to our children and future generations to protect our countryside and honour the trust that has been placed in us to do that.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3140  
**Respondent:** 15389025 / Keith Cogan  
**Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch 400 homes & traveller sites! Where is the evidence for this requirement, this is massive over-development and in green belt. Why are we not protecting the greenbelt and the area. This completely contravenes the very idea and intent of green belt to stop is joining up villages, along with the others it will destroy the essence of these villages..

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
development. The area, which is currently Green Belt, includes ancient woodland, which, once lost, could never be replaced. The area already has an established industrial site at Slyfield. Given the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 showed an expected 80% reduction in the required employment floor space from the previous draft plan, this could easily be accommodated at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2404  Respondent: 15390337 / Daniel Smith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2412  Respondent: 15390369 / Lewis Thorpe  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Additional housing (A43) at Garlick's Arch will exasperate and add to the local chaos on the roads and the already stretched amenities. I therefore strongly object to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq metres of industrialspace at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial is not needed as there are many offices and warehouses sitting idle in the local area. Fill these sites first before developing more empty units. Any new industrial units should be built at Slyfield where there is a ready an established site and the roads can cope with the traffic. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2415  Respondent: 15390401 / William Stewart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick's Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2426  Respondent: 15390785 / Francesca Molossi- Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Also heavy traffic would be attracted to Garlick’s Arch site from the M25 and A3, a lot of it using the A247, which is not suited to this traffic!

I object because GBC’s Transport Assessment was not available to Councillors for the vote taken on 24th May for these proposals. It was published on 6th June! Infrastructure requirements must be assessed before major proposals can be voted on.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2432</th>
<th>Respondent: 15391361 / Paul Thorpe</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional housing (A43) at Garlick's Arch will exasperate and add to the local chaos on the roads and the already stressed amenities. Therefore strongly object to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.</strong> The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial is not needed as there are many offices and warehouses sitting idle in the local area. Fill these sites first before developing more empty units. Any new industrial units should be built at Slyfield where there is already an established site and the roads can cope with the traffic. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2444</th>
<th>Respondent: 15391809 / Dan Haskins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I further object to the Garlick’s Arch development. 400 homes and large industrial space will create not only a crowded, unpleasant living environment, but total traffic meltdown. I am stuck in very high volume traffic on a daily basis, and know that this huge development will bring us all to a standstill. An additional access point to the A3 will ease this, quite the opposite, drivers will simply join the queue in a different place, and queue back onto the local roads too. I therefore also object to the new interchange, that will simply add more queues to the existing ones, not ease any congestion at all.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have made each of my objections clear, and I hope that those I elected to represent my family and I will listen carefully to the explicit and grave concerns voiced by a whole community</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to Garlick's Arch being built on as it is a site which is covered in ancient woodland and should be preserved as such. Once our history is destroyed, it will be gone forever and there will be no going back. The local road infrastructure for Send and Ripley is not suitable if the Garlick's Arch proposal for industrial and housing developments are allowed to go ahead. The local roads are totally unsuitable for GV's and a large increase in general traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites. A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:

i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and

ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2456  Respondent: 15397953 / Gillian Dobson  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it's removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Gartick's Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2460  Respondent: 15398241 / Paul McNamara  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Thirdly, I object the proposed development of Garlick’s Arch. Building 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space is unnecessary. There is no need for additional industrial space and removes the buffer between the villages and the A3. It seems clear to me that this is a sweetheart deal between the potential developers and GBC. Burnt Common is a
brownfield site that could more easily be used. Garlick’s Arch floods easily and regularly and as such makes it an
unviable development option. To continue, there is no sustainable transport infrastructure to allow Garlick’s Arch to be
successful – the local railway station at Cladon is already very busy and the car-park is already 100% full every day and
bus routes are minimal. So, it’s likely each new resident will have a car, leading to increased pollution and health risks.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/959  Respondent: 15398529 / Judith Linnegar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I wish to register my objection to the revised local plan for the A43 site, Garlicks Arch.

The impact this will bring on the already stretched local resources and infrastructure will be catastrophic for Ripley and
surrounding area.

The housing will be on greenbelt land and the potential increase of housing will be extremely harmful to the rural nature
of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Cladon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2462  Respondent: 15398593 / Kirsten Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

A43

I object to the plans outlined for Site A43. This site is new to the overall plans and was not included in the Regulation 18
draft proposal and so it has not previously had any level of consultation. The removal of this land from the Green Belt
requires exceptional circumstances and I do not see that the case has been made for this; in the long-term, developments
such as this one may be detrimental to the overall goal of preventing urban sprawl and the merging of settlements such as
Guildford and Woking. The provision of housing on this scale at this location would also have a significant impact on
the schools in the local area; for example, Send infant school is currently being rebuilt but there is no plan for any
increase in capacity. I understand that the site may be prone to flooding and contains an ancient woodland and so the
development would endanger trees from C16 and so there are conservation issues with the selection of this site.

I also object to the plans for the industrial development; the 2015 Employment Land Needs Assessment indicated a
reduction of 80% in the requirements for employment floor space while this proposal is a repeat of that contained in a
previous draft local plan that used an older evidence base. If there is a need for further development of industrial space,
there should be consideration given to an expansion of Slyfield as this seems to be a very appropriate site for such.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
20. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. I have personally been involved in an accident at this junction within the last 5 years due to heavy traffic queing and obstructing the sight line to exit Oak Grange Road. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: | pslp172/4726 | Respondent: | 15398657 / Kim Roberts | Agent: |
| Document: | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) | is Sound? ( ) | is Legally Compliant? ( ) |
| 1. | I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches |
| 2. | It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people |
| 3. | There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location |
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport.

With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2560  **Respondent:** 15406017 / Eleanor Roberts  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1240  Respondent: 15406145 / Paul Moore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There appear to be no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
1. **The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]”**

2. **The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”**

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2570  **Respondent:** 15406529 / David I Allan  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to Garlick's Arch and its proposal to build the 400 homes and 7,000 sq meter industrial space. It does not seem to be supported by any evidence that it is needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I OBJECT to POLICY A43, adding a further 400 houses (this on top of the already unsustainable 13,860 dwellings) and 7,000 square meters of commercial premises, all of it on Green Belt without any "exceptional circumstances". The way this site has been introduced without the required consultation serves to confirm that GBC planning members are thumbing their noses at proper procedure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

13. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. It has not been confirmed to why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this
I am also concerned that the fields behind my property will be used as site access/egress with a typical works compound, and of course the construction site, for the entire works period. Given, it's proximity this will see a 24 hour security fenced and lit compound. Movements of heavily construction traffic within a short distance from my house, will happen 5 or 6 days a week to amount to thousands of movements of material away and deliveries. My whole family will suffer the consequences of noise pollution, dust pollution, and construction activity for the duration of the development.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through Clandon and Burnt Common. This increased funneling will cause immense damage to those arwas with narrow roads, all increasing the possibility of road traffic accidents.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities of the Borough in this regard. Ther has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7508  Respondent: 15418849 / Sarah Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch, as this area regularly floods and building additional housing there would mean that water needs to go somewhere else, causing further flooding. It is also an area of ancient woodland. With proper use of brownfield sites, this green belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7516  Respondent: 15419489 / Janet Drew  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the planned construction of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This would destroy ancient woodland and completely alter the nature of Send and Ripley villages to become one big strip development. Send Road and Sendmarsh Road, as well as Polesden Lane, are already extremely busy roads with traffic jams and queues on many mornings, particularly during term time. Traffic flows would be hugely increases as a result of such a housing development and the industrial development would increase the flow of large lorries which are already having to mount pavement on Sendmarsh Road to pass one another. There would be danger to pedestrians and from traffic based pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7525  Respondent: 15419713 / Russell Woods  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the planned construction of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This would destroy ancient woodland and completely alter the nature of Send and Ripley villages to become one big strip development. Send Road and Sendmarsh Road, as well as Polesden Lane, are already extremely busy roads with traffic jams and queues on many mornings, particularly during term time. Traffic flows would be hugely increases as a result of such a housing development and the industrial development would increase the flow of large lorries which are already having to mount pavement on Sendmarsh Road to pass one another. There would be danger to pedestrians and from traffic based pollution.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at GARLICKS Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The industrial site is not needed and the site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. Guildford housing requirements have been grossly exaggerated and refused to disclose their calculations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2739 Respondent: 15420833 / Marjorie Moss Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate.

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan.

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders.

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site.

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of "through" traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot b.e improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2728  Respondent: 15421633 / Julia Cogan  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In addition I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required
employment floor space from the previous draft plan and there are plenty of examples of unused existing floor space that should be utilised before provision of more. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available. The additional traffic that would be brought to the area by an industrial area will not be able to be serviced by the road infrastructure and the proposal for the new interchange will in no way help.

The Garlick’s Arch site also has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding. Economic growth in the Guildford area should not require the loss of our rural heritage or be targeted at an area that cannot cope with it.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2741</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7586  Respondent: 15422145 / Orlando Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/2749</th>
<th>Respondent: 15422529 / David Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council’s eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7588  **Respondent:** 15422625 / Graham Burrows  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( )  **is Sound?** ( )  **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I object to the 400 new proposed homes at Garlic Arch, with new roads belching out onto an already busy roads.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Additional housing (A43) at Garlick's Arch will exasperate and add to the local chaos on the roads and the already stretched amenities. I therefore strongly object to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial is not needed as there are many offices and warehouses sitting idle in the local area. Fill these sites first before developing more empty units. Any new industrial units should be built at Slyfield where there is already an established site and the roads can cope with the traffic. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

In addition to the other proposals, I object to Policy A42, 45 houses proposed to be built in Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane. Tannery Lane is a country, single access and the staggered cross roads- junction with Send Road is already dangerous, especially due peak times. This will just add to the growing congestion in Send. Planning permission has previously been given for 64 apartments at the Tannery and for building the marina, both of which will generate additional traffic (large vehicles for boats etc) The lane cannot cope with any more traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Thirdly, I object to building 400 houses and 7000sq m of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. The area has no need for additional industrial space and if necessary, surely would be better placed and served at Slyfield. This area also buffers the village from the A3. Who would want to live in such proximity to the A3 with its noise and pollution? This is a lovely area with ancient woodland that should not be destroyed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2788  Respondent: 15425793 / Warrick Howell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of the Garlick’s Arch site from the greenbelt. GBC has not followed correct procedure under regulation 18 and its inclusion is therefore not legally compliant

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2795  Respondent: 15425889 / Jaqueline Appleby  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( No ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to land at A43 Garlick's Arch being included in the Local Plan. There is no justification for removing this site from the Green Belt and there are no exceptional circumstances

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2801  Respondent: 15426113 / Sarah Ross  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch which is currently the site of ancient woodland. Brownfield areas around Guildford should be used for this, NOT precious Green Belt land. There is no road infrastructure to support these additional houses. The A3 is already backed up way before rush hour.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

This site had been previously considered and rejected before the previous draft of the Plan. The site was then inserted in this draft only hours before its publication without any consultation. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. This is a cavalier approach to public engagement by the Council.

1. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and being cut back and future residents will have to rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

1. The site is susceptible to flooding and development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

1. The Council appears to view the development as an enabling site to obtain land and developer funding for slip roads on/off the A3. This is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking Green Belt land. The slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip roads is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham school was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

1. The development will put more traffic on to the A247 through West Clandon-a road which Surrey County Council says cannot be improved. This road is already very heavily used at peak times and when the A3 suffers problems. It is unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. The development will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians including children walking to and from the school.

1. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Rather than developing Garlick’s Arch, there is an existing brownfield site just to the south of the site at Burnt Common, with surplus land that could accommodate a further development.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed and there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. So why was a brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site? There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2811  **Respondent:** 15426369 / Harvey West  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch and its late
substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to building 400 houses and some 7000 sq m of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. The site floods and is an ancient woodland. The industrial space, if needed, should be at Slyfield.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding should be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so-called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running South past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for Southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).
The addition of North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would have serious repercussions for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the North, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the East of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas, as the traffic would be on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2869  Respondent: 15427937 / Elizabeth Lawes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I Object;

To the building of 400 houses at Garlick's Arch, this IS Greenbelt, also a flood area, and increased access by cars etc would be a danger to Local residents. Warehousing should be based at Slyfield were their already is an industrial Estate with adequate access and fewer residential house to upset. I object to taking down more of our beautiful old trees and woodland which has existed since the 16th Century. There are so many industrial sites which remain empty after building, is this going to be the case here. waiting to be vandalised, graffiti and made to look an eyesore.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2865  Respondent: 15427969 / Chris Mealing  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2882  Respondent: 15428225 / Vian Lee  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2906  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the New Local Plan in principal, since it fails to achieve Guildford Borough Council's stated objective of "protecting the borough's most important countryside, landscapes and heritage". This New Plan fails to achieve any of these objectives in the case of Send Village in particular, whose History dates back past the Middle Ages and proposes development of 480 houses and 7,000 sq metres of industrial and warehousing space, which will destroy Send's living environment; local countryside; areas of natural beauty; and cause harm to ancient woodlands - let alone a village community which has survived for hundreds of years.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2907  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the fact that POLICY A 43.30 ha is a NEW site not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. This is Green Belt land, permanently protected by the NPPF, which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. It is a sensitive conservation site with ancient woodland and trees which have been there since the 16th Century and which would be irreparably damaged.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3482  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to POLICY A 43.30 ha LAND AT GARLICK'S ARCH Burnt Common for the building of 400 houses and 7,000 sq metres of industrial and warehousing. If there was need for more industrial space, it could be developed more easily on the existing industrial site at Slyfield and no new 4-way A3 interchange would be needed in this environmentally sensitive area. There is photographic evidence of flooding on the site, making it unsuitable for housing. If this area was developed it would destroy the village communities of Send, Ripley and West Clandon and the quality of life and health of its residents and cause major problems in relation to Road Safety. There is no need for any more houses in this area, or even as many houses as the new Local Plan states are needed (13,860) - neither is there any need for the additional 7,000 sq metres of industrial and warehousing space.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3821  Respondent: 15429985 / Jennifer Slade  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change - Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh because despite thousands of previous objections to development, it is now proposed that 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople Plots are constructed. GBC has produced no evidence for any proven need for Showpeople Plots in this area, which is permanent Green Belt with no "exceptional circumstances". This area contains irreplaceable ancient woodland, dating back to Elizabeth I, which GBC is now proposing to destroy. It is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation having frequent flooding and is a health risk for people and animals, being contaminated land with lead shot following 50 years of shooting activity. The proposed development will generate excessive traffic on roads that already get gridlocked in Send and Ripley at peak times and also remove the main area of green space between the villages of Ripley and Send, which is contrary to the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7367  Respondent: 15430049 / Michael Armstrong  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object very strongly to the 2016 draft local plan.

I object to the disproportionate amount of development in the area, particularly to the Garlick Arch site at Burnt Common for at least 400 homes. The Portsmouth Road is already heavily laden with traffic and drivers often cut through this road in order to ‘short cut’ the jam on the A3 leading to the M25. The villages of Ripley, Wisley, Send, and Clandon are constantly affected by traffic when the main roads are jammed, a regular occurrence. How can the addition of 2,000 homes at the Wisley site be considered in view of traffic congestion.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7370  Respondent: 15430049 / Michael Armstrong  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the last minute inclusion of new sites with less than 2 weeks notice, leaving people very little time or no time at all to even address their concerns. Most people have hectic lives and this must be taken into consideration in local plans.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/2930  Respondent: 15430945 / Rosalind Molesworth  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the statement under A43 that there is a stated opportunity that this will improve bus frequency and encourage travel to and from the site. It is hard to understand how the development of the number of houses proposed will in fact change the current occasional bus service to sufficiently reliable and frequent but service that can be relied upon for travel to and from employment.

I object under A43 the opportunity to reduce the flood risk. Any development will increase the risk both locally and in the area in general. All surface water drains to the Wey navigation which frequently overflows during periods of high rainfall and development put increased pressure on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2279  Respondent: 15432705 / Gordon Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2720  **Respondent:** 15433153 / Helen Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I also object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It will cause the village to be 'over-developed' with the consequent impact on local services such as schools and health services which are already stretched
• It will join up the villages of Ripley and Send into one ribbon development and so defeat the key purpose of having a Green Belt
• It is a flood zone 2 area
• It will cause excessive traffic which will increase air pollution and cause congestion

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2346  **Respondent:** 15433441 / Jacob Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It will cause the village to be 'over-developed' with the consequent impact on local services such as schools and health services which are already stretched
• It will join up the villages of Ripley and Send into one ribbon development and so defeat the key purpose of having a Green Belt
• It is a flood zone 2 area
• It will cause excessive traffic which will increase air pollution and cause congestion

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/2995  **Respondent:** 15433473 / Kay Webb  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site and has not been consulted on previously. This is not only permanently protected Green Belt, but also a site of ancient woodland containing trees planted in the 16th century, and serving as a rich habitat for wildlife and plants. The industrial development of this site is completely unnecessary. There is a more appropriate site ready and available at Slyfield. There is also a history of flooding in this area.

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the development of a new four-way interchange onto the A3 which would mean that the narrow Send Road (A247) would be the main route for traffic leaving the M25 and A3. It is already overcrowded and vulnerable to traffic jams and this proposal would be an utter disaster for Send and Ripley villages. Further traffic from this development would result in gridlocked roads. Send will be the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 at Junction 10, the new houses proposed at Wisley, and the new development proposed at Burpham – our roads cannot cope with this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2625  Respondent: 15433473 / Kay Webb  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43, Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh; Despite 1000s of previous objections this site is still being proposed for development. This a site of ancient woodland and a beautiful area of green belt – no exceptional circumstances exist that should allow for this area to be built on. The increase in traffic from the 400 homes on its own will cause gridlock on our already overburdened roads, but in conjunction with other proposed sites in Send and the surrounding area is just madness.

I object to the allocation of 6 travelling showpeople sites in Policy A43, Garlick’s Arch. There is no proven demand for Travelling showpeople plots in this location, and combined with Policy A44 Winds Ridge, we will have a total of 8 of these plots - this is too much for our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3001  Respondent: 15433569 / Jennifer Beddoes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the new site at Garlicks Arch being introduced as an after thought when it had been previously dismissed as unsustainable. I also object to the sites at Clock Barn Nursery, Tannery Lane and the land west of Wind Ridge being included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3051  Respondent: 15434241 / Valerie Sowerby  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
5. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is currently protected from development as Green Belt.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch, however, the Plan’s preference states that previously developed land should be considered first.

There are no planned increases in schools or Doctor’s surgeries.

The local secondary schools are already too full for local residents to gain access to – our children’s allocated school was a 40 minute bus ride away which is why I ended up paying for private education!

It is already virtually impossible to get an appointment at our local Doctor’s surgery in Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3049  
Respondent: 15434273 / Brian Crosby  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43) since there is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed but that site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Developing Garlick’s Arch would cause the loss of 4 local rural businesses which are successful.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which are clearly sustainable since they have been for there decades employing local people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6194  
Respondent: 15434305 / Antonia Phillips  
Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object, to the proposal to build 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43), opposite Send Marsh road. This site is covered by ancient woodland; industrial sites will destroy this forever. The extra industrial space, if required, could be added to the current industrial area in Slyfield, as adding to this industrial area would have much less impact. As Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated with a refusal to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1553  Respondent: 15434433 / James Collins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3076  Respondent: 15436065 / Victor Smith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Regarding: ‘The Local Plan’
I request that my comments below be seen by the planning Inspector:

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common for the following reasons:

1. My property in Manor Road, Send Marsh where I have lived for 45 years is now classed as being in a flood plain area. This was narrowly spared from flooding in the late 1960s. I feel that the development of the area known as Garlicks Arch will greatly increase the risk of flooding in Send Marsh village which includes my property. The Send stream which boarders the rear of my property carries surface and flood water. Although flood protection improvements were made several years ago in Send Marsh Road, the level of the stream on some occasions can be very high during heavy rainfall. Consequently I am greatly concerned of the risk posed by further surface drainage water running off of a large development / concreted area.

1. Due to traffic at peak times of the day, the junction of Send Marsh Road with the Portsmouth Road can be both difficult and dangerous. Further traffic in this immediate vicinity will greatly increase this already present problem.
1. I cannot understand why Guilford Borough Council wish to deplete the Green Belt within its boundaries instead of prioritising existing brown field sites. The character of this borough is strengthened by having individual villages such as Send and Send Marsh which enhance the beauty of the this part of Surrey. I therefore strongly object to Send Marsh / Send losing its Green Belt Status. Local councillors together with central government gave a promise to protect the Green Belt. Therefore you as a council should uphold this pledge.

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt common because of the increase in local traffic including from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield. Additional local traffic would affect the already busy Portsmouth Road and particularly Send Road which is often at gridlock already during peak times.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch Burnt Common for
the following reasons:

1. My parents property where I live is in Manor Road, Send Marsh is now classed as being in a flood plain area.
   This was narrowly spared from flooding in the late 1960s. I feel that the development of the area known as
   Garlicks Arch will greatly increase the risk of flooding in Send Marsh village which includes my parents
   property where I live. The Send stream which boarders the rear of my property carries surface and flood water.
   Although flood protection improvements were made several years ago in Send Marsh Road, the level of the
   stream on some occasions can be very high during heavy rainfall. Consequently I am greatly concerned of the
   risk posed by further surface drainage water running off of a large development / concreted area.

1. Due to traffic at peak times of the day, the junction of Send Marsh Road with the Portsmouth Road can be both
difficult and dangerous. Further traffic in this immediate vicinity will greatly increase this already present
problem.

I cannot understand why Guilford Borough Council wish to deplete the Green Belt within its boundaries instead of
prioritising existing brown field sites. The character of this borough is strengthened by having individual villages such as
Send and Send Marsh which enhance the beauty of the this part of Surrey. I therefore strongly object to Send Marsh /
Send losing its Green Belt Status. Local councillors together with central government gave a promise to protect the Green
Belt. Therefore you as a council should uphold this pledge.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3092  Respondent: 15437089 / Jamie Manester  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

400 houses & 7000 sq m industrial space at Garlick's Arch - I again object due to the paramount negative impact it
would have on the environment, infrastructure and services of Send. Not to mention the pollution

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3108  Respondent: 15437793 / Paul Hester  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

• Garlick's Arch (policy A43)

The proposal to build so many new houses and light industrial storage/workshops on what is part of the Green Belt defies
all reason. We have been constantly told that the green belt was safe and it was essential for it to remain in place in order
to prevent urban sprawl.

Villages need to keep their separate identities but if the green belt barriers are ripped down then how is this to be
achieved? I object to any in-setting of any villages in the Green Belt. Last year an application to build 25 houses on part
of this site was refused, so how can the building of 400 houses suddenly become acceptable? This is a disproportionate amount of development in one area of the borough.

Send Marsh /Burnt common has no shops and very limited resources – I hardly think that “Little Waitrose” can be listed as a shop when it only an overpriced addendum to the garage. The doctor's surgery is over-subscribed and getting an appointment is becoming a significant problem. I understand that plans have been mooted to reduce further the bus timetable in the area. In order to go about one's normal everyday life recourse will have to be made to the motor car.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/3149</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15438049 / David A Sprigings</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to site policy and at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon as I believe that the circumstances leading to the inclusion of these site policies in the Local Plan are in breach of regulation requirements under The Town and Country Planning Act.

They were only presented to Guildford Borough Council on 11 May 2016, just 13 days before the Executive Meeting of the Council to agree putting the updated Draft Local Plan, including these two site policies, out for Public Consultation. I believe that this is in breach of regulations as there was totally insufficient pre-consultation under Regulation 18.

The very late addition of A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley is clearly demonstrated by the Inclusion on GBC's Local Plan website of a draft version of the Submission Document, dated June 2016 on the front cover, which includes A43 (2016 classification) as Land at Burntcommon Warehouse with 100 homes, which Is site proposal 74 from the 2014 Draft Local Plan. This is still there on 10/07/2016.

The very late inclusion of A43 and A43a is also clear from the fact that in the Local Plan section on page 04 of the Council's Summer 2016 issue of "About Guildford", which was delivered in June 2016, it says "...In April this year we published the revised Draft local Plan.."

How could the Council publish the revised Draft Local Plan in April 2016 when site allocations A43 and A43a were not presented to the Council for inclusion in the revised Draft Local Plan until 11 May 2016 and the Executive did not approve the draft for submission for Public Consultation until 24 May 2016?

Is the Council trying to mislead the public by suggesting that the current Draft Local Plan was published in April?

I object to site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon as I believe that the circumstances leading to the inclusion of these site policies are, at best, highly unorthodox and irregular and need thorough checking by the Planning Inspectorate.

I understand from a very reliable source that the land for Site Policy A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon has been gifted to the Council by Its owners and that those owners have also offered to pay the £20m cost of A43a.

Isn't it a strange coincidence that part of the land at Site A43 land at Garlick’s Arch is also owned by the owners of the land being gifted to the Council for Site A43a, which, if site A43 is approved, would no doubt result in an extremely large Financial windfall for the owners?
Isn’t it also a strange coincidence that these are the very same sites which were only proposed to the Council for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan on 11 May 2016, which I believe to be in breach of regulations as in 11 above?

Although I understand that the cost of the A3/A247 on/off slip roads is to be borne by the owners of the land, the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 shows on page 68 the £10m likely cost for each of the two slip roads as "Developer funded". If the cost IS to be borne by the land-owners who have gifted the land to the Council, it is very misleading to state in the plan documentation that the cost is to be Developer funded.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the inclusion of 400 new homes on site policy A43 Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley as there is no need for this many to be built. The site 74 Land around Burntcommon warehouse which included 100 new homes should have the 100 homes reinstated and increased to 159. The plan Sustainability Appraisal page 110 shows 100 as Housing Capacity for Use H and a further 59 Housing Capacity for Use E, so 159 in total.

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley as it is an area of Ancient Woodland which includes a number of trees with Tree Preservation Orders. These beautiful trees should be retained and there should be no building on this site.

At the Council Executive Meeting on 24/05/2016 I was appalled by the comment from one Councillor in support of inclusion of site policy A43 "they are only trees, they are going to die anyway".

Yes, they will die (eventually) anyway, but this very short-sighted view ignores the fact that the trees date back to the 16 Century and the life span of such trees is several times that of any houses or industrial buildings, as well as being much better to look at and benefiting the environment instead of harming it.

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment.

In terms of the environment the words of Tony Juniper, President of the Wildlife Trusts, are much better than my own so I quote his from the Spring 2016 issue of Surrey Nature, published by the Surrey Wildlife Trust:

"Many people have become used to hearing that looking after our environment and conserving nature is an unaffordable luxury, especially during times of economic hardship. Nothing could be further from the truth. The more research we have the more we see that nature is not a distraction from our interests as a country, but is essential for our health, wealth and security. At a time of rising population, increased demand for resources and pressure on the land it is more vital than ever that this message is heard".

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment in terms of noise pollution.

At the Executive Council Meeting on 24/05/2016 a point made supporting the proposed amendment to remove A43 Garlick's Arch from the Draft Local Plan was that the noise problem from A3 traffic to residents living on the other side of Portsmouth Road from Garlick's Arch would be worsened by felling the Ancient Woodland on the site.
The response from the Leader of the Council was that the trees do not form a noise barrier, a view which was met with derision from the members of the public present, including myself.

I also object to A43 on the grounds of Noise Pollution as noise metering has, I understand, been carried out between Garlick's Arch and the A3 and, I am assured, the readings in decibels exceed the allowable noise level for the building of new homes so none should be built there.

It seems that the Council chooses to ignore anything which is a barrier to its plans.

I object to the inclusion of Site Policy A41 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh and Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of its adverse impact on wildlife on the site.

The site has numerous species including Badgers, Bats, Deer, Red Kite and their habitat would be destroyed by this development. I believe that the Water Vole, now rare in this country, has also been seen.

I understand that no wildlife study has been undertaken in respect of this site which appears to be another procedural shortcoming.

I object to site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon in respect of the proposed timing of these developments in the Draft Local plan.

Site A43 and at Garlick's Arch is stated to be suitable for the first phase of planned development (first 5 years) (Executive 11 May 2016 Supplementary Information page 8 Delivery "...the Garlick's Arch site is deliverable in the first five years of the plan") whilst page 68 of the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 shows both SRN9 "A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road" and SRNIO "A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road" to be delivered between 2021 and 2027.

Does no-one involved with the Draft Local Plan have any common sense or apply any logic to these plans, especially in respect of development timing schedules?

If it is the case that, should both these site policies be approved and delivered with A43 first and A43a some years later, the traffic congestion in the local area would be an absolute nightmare.

The very numerous heavy lorries that would be required to remove huge trees and deliver vast amounts of building materials to site A43 would have to use existing inadequate roads, either off the A3 through Ripley or via the Burntcommon roundabout at the junction with the A247.

This would be intolerable and dangerous. Portsmouth Road junction with Send Marsh Road is already a dangerous black spot for accidents, as I know to my cost since a car drove into mine there earlier this year, the other driver having ignored the Give Way signs for traffic turning onto Portsmouth Road from Send Marsh Road. The existing junction of the A247 and the A3 southbound on-slip is also an existing dangerous accident black spot. Both of these would only become worse and more dangerous with these planned developments, as would the junctions of Burnt Common Lane, Kiln Lane and Grove Heath Road with Portsmouth Road.

I object to site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh/Burntcommon in respect of the lack of infrastructure planning for the site.

The sections of the Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 in respect of Utilities:

Electricity & Gas Distribution & Supply pages 76/77/78

Water Supply pages 78/79

Wastewater Connections & Treatment pages 79/80

Flood Risk Reduction: Surface Water Mitigation Measures pages 80/81

contain no mention whatever of A43 Garlick's Arch.
How can this planned site development go ahead when there are apparently no plans whatsoever to provide the utility infrastructure which would be required to support 400 homes and 7000 sq mts of industrial/warehousing development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5275  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site policies A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burnt common and Ripley and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt common as I believe that the circumstances leading to the inclusion of these site policies in the Local Plan are in breach of regulation requirements under The Town and Country Planning

They were only presented to Guildford Borough Council on 11 May 2016, just 13 days before the Executive Meeting of the Council to agree putting the updated Draft Local Plan, including these two site policies, out for Public Consultation. I believe that this is in breach of regulations as there was totally insufficient pre consultation under Regulation 18.

The very late addition of A43 Land at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh, Burnt common and Ripley is clearly demonstrated by the Inclusion on GBC's Local Plan website of a draft version of the Submission Document, dated June 2016 on the front cover, which includes A43 (2016 classification) as Land at Burntcommon Warehouse with 100 homes, which is site proposal 74 from the 2014 Draft Local Plan. This Is still there on 10/07/2016.

The very late inclusion of A43 and A43a is also clear from the fact that in the Local Plan section on page 04 of the Council's Summer 2016 issue of "About Guildford", which was delivered in June 2016, it says "... in April this year we published the revised Draft Local Plan....".

How could the Council publish the revised Draft Local Plan in April 2016 when site allocations A43 and A43a were not presented to the Council for inclusion in the revised Draft Local Plan until 11 May 2016 and the Executive did not approve the draft for submission for Public Consultation until 24 May 2016?

Is the Council trying to mislead the public by suggesting that the current Draft Local Plan was published in April?

I object to site policies A43 Land at Garlick's Arch and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon as I believe that the circumstances leading to the inclusion of these site policies are, at best, highly unorthodox and irregular and need thorough checking by the Planning Inspectorate

I understand from a very reliable source that the land for Site Policy A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from the A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon has been gifted to the Council by its owners and that those owners have also offered to pay the £20m cost of A43a.

Isn't it a strange coincidence that part of the land at Site A43 land at Garlick's Arch is also owned by the owners of the land being gifted to the Council for Site A43a, which, if site A43 is approved, would no doubt result in an extremely large financial windfall for the owners?

Isn't it also a strange coincidence that these are the very same sites which were only proposed to the Council for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan on 11 May 2016, which I believe to be in breach of regulations as in 11 above?
Although I understand that the cost of the A3/A247 on/off slip roads is to be borne by the owners of the land, the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 shows on page 68 the £10m likely cost for each of the two slip roads as "Developer funded". If the cost IS to be borne by the land-owners who have gifted the land to the Council, it is very misleading to state in the plan documentation that the cost is to be Developer funded.

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5286  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlic's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley as it is a flood risk. The Environment Agency Flood Risk Map shows this as category 3 high flood risk so it should not be built on. (Policy P4)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5287  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlic's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley as it is unsustainable with totally inadequate public transport. Bus services are poor and infrequent, and Surrey County Council is proposing to reduce the number of journeys serving Ripley, Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Send, whilst the nearest Railway Station at West Clandon is a 40 minute walk away, and that is only if you are fit. (Policy S1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5289  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of 400 new homes on site policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Burntcommon and Ripley as there is no need for this many to be. The site 74 Land around Burntcommon warehouse which included 100 new homes should have the 100 homes reinstated and increased to 159. The plan Sustainability Appraisal page 110 shows 100 as Housing Capacity for Use H and a further 59 Housing Capacity for Use E, so 159 in total.

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley as it is an area of Ancient Woodland which includes a number of trees with Tree Preservation. These beautiful trees should be retained and there should be no building on this site.
At the Council Executive Meeting on 24/05/2016 I was appalled by the comment from one Councillor in support of inclusion of site policy A43 "they are only trees, they are going to die anyway".

Yes, they will die (eventually) anyway, but this very short-sighted view ignores the fact that the trees date back to the 16th Century and the life span of such trees is several times that of any houses or industrial buildings, as well as being much better to look at and benefitting the environment instead of harming it. (Policy 03)

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment.

In terms of the environment the words of Tony Juniper, President of the Wildlife Trusts, are much better than my own so I quote his from the Spring 2016 issue of Surrey Nature, published by the Surrey Wildlife Trust:

"Many people have become used to hearing that looking after our environment and conserving nature is an unaffordable luxury, especially during times of economic hardship. Nothing could be further from the truth. The more research we have the more we see that nature is not a distraction from our interests as a country, but is essential for our health, wealth and security. At a time of rising population, increased demand for resources and pressure on the land it is more vital than ever that this message is heard".

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment in terms of air pollution. (Policy 13)

I object to inclusion of site policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of the harm it would do to the local environment in terms of noise pollution.

At the Executive Council Meeting on 24/05/2016 a point made supporting the proposed amendment to remove A43 Garlick's Arch from the Draft Local Plan was that the noise problem from A3 traffic to residents living on the other side of Portsmouth Road from Garlick's Arch would be worsened by felling the Ancient Woodland on the site.

The response from the Leader of the Council was that the trees do not form a noise barrier, a view which was met with derision from the members of the public present, including myself.

I also object to A43 on the grounds of Noise Pollution as noise metering has, I understand, been carried out between Garlick's Arch and the A3 and, I am assured, the readings in decibels exceed the allowable noise level for the building of new homes so none should be built there.

It seems that the Council chooses to ignore anything which is a barrier to its plans.

I object to the inclusion of Site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh and Burntcommon and Ripley on the grounds of its adverse impact on wildlife on the

The site has numerous species including Badgers, Bats, Deer, Red Kite and their habitat would be destroyed by this development. I believe that the Water Vole, now rare in this country, has also been seen.

I understand that no wildlife study has been undertaken in respect of this site which appears to be another procedural shortcoming.

I object to site policies A43 Land at Garlick's Arch and A43a Land for new north facing slip roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burntcommon in respect of the proposed timing of these developments in the Draft Local Plan.

Site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch is stated to be suitable for the first phase of planned development (first 5 years) (Executive 11 May 2016 Supplementary Information page 8 Delivery "....the Garlick's Arch site is deliverable in the first five years of the plan") whilst page 68 of the Draft Guildford borough Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 shows both SRN9 "A3 northbound on-slip at A247 Clandon Road" and SRN10 "A3 southbound off-slip at A247 Clandon Road" to be delivered between 2021 and 2027.
Does no-one involved with the Draft Local Plan have any common sense or apply any logic to these plans, especially in respect of development timing schedules?

If it is the case that, should both these site policies be approved and delivered with A43 first and A43a some years later, the traffic congestion in the local area would be an absolute nightmare.

The very numerous heavy lorries that would be required to remove huge trees and deliver vast amounts of building materials to site A43 would have to use existing inadequate roads, either off the A3 through Ripley or via the Burnt common roundabout at the junction with the A247.

This would be intolerable and dangerous. Portsmouth Road junction with Send Marsh Road is already a dangerous black spot for accidents, as I know to my cost since a car drove into mine there earlier this year, the other driver having ignored the Give Way signs for traffic turning onto Portsmouth Road from Send Marsh Road. The existing junction of the A247 and the A3 southbound on-slip is also an existing dangerous accident black spot. Both of these would only become worse and more dangerous with these planned developments, as would the junctions of Burnt Common, Kiln lane and Grove Heath Road with Portsmouth Road.

I object to site policies A43 and at Garlick's Arch Send Marsh/Burntcommon in respect of the lack of infrastructure planning for the site.

The sections of the Guildford borough infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 in respect of Utilities:

Electricity & Gas Distribution & Supply pages 76/77/78

Water Supply pages 78/79

Wastewater Connections & Treatment pages 79/80

Flood Risk Reduction: Surface Water Mitigation Measures pages 80/81 contain no mention whatever of A43 Garlick's Arch.

How can this planned site development go ahead when there are apparently no plans whatsoever to provide the utility infrastructure which would be required to support 400 homes and 7000 sq mts of industrial/warehousing development?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4335  Respondent: 15438049 / David A Sprigings  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch as it is totally wrong to increase the number of planned homes by the addition of Travelling Showpeople plots when the total number of homes in the borough during the period of the plan has been calculated as 1,434 lower than the 2016 draft Local Plan. There is therefore no justification for an increase on this site.

The Foreword on page 5 by Councillor Paul Spooner - Leader of the Council, includes the following in the fourth paragraph:
"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated is contingent on the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan. The Council will work with infrastructure providers and developers to ensure that sufficient physical, social and green infrastructure is provided during the plan period".

As the "delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon" the provision of new infrastructure is a change in the plan it can be commented upon and gives rise to the following objections, in conjunction with changes to site allocations

I object to Site Allocation A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley as the delivery of all site allocations is contingent upon the delivery of new physical infrastructure (see Foreword extract above) whilst the plan does not include any Utility Infrastructure at all for A43: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 2 Utilities pages 320-325, which contains NOTHING in respect of Garlick's Arch in respect of Electricity and Gas distribution and supply; Water supply; Wastewater connections and treatment; Flood risk reduction: surface water mitigation measures, so sufficient physical infrastructure for utilities is NOT planned for.

I object to Site Allocation A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley as the delivery of all site allocations is contingent upon the delivery of new green infrastructure (see Foreword extract above) whilst the plan does not include any Green Infrastructure at all for A43: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 3 Green Infrastructure pages 325-328, which contains NOTHING in respect of Garlick's Arch in respect of Green Infrastructure.

To the contrary, the existing Green Infrastructure at Garlick's Arch will be almost wholly taken away due to the planned wanton destruction of the current Ancient (some dating back to the 16th century) and other woodland.

I object to the addition to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities as this is wholly inappropriate in the rural environment of Send Marsh, Burnt Common, Send and Ripley within the Green Belt.

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch as this site allocation is outside the scope of the GBC 2017 Local Plan policy in respect of such sites which is as follows:

Point 4.2 Housing Policy, Policy H1 Homes for all, which begins on page 35 includes the following on page 36 under the heading Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches and plots:

(7) Accommodation for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople (whether they meet the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites definition or not) should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need. Also page 40 "Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation is required within development sites of 500 homes or more to help create sustainable, mixed use communities with suitable accommodation for all".

A43 Garlick's Arch is therefore OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THIS POLICY.

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch as the GBC 2017 Local Plan Policy for such plots ((7) on page 36) shows that 6 pitches or plots should be provided for development sites of 1500 - 1999 homes and so A43 Garlick's Arch is totally outside the scope of this policy.

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch as there is no justification for locating in Send Marsh/Burnt Common 75% of the total of 8 such plots identified for the whole of the borough.

I object to the inclusion of site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch in the 2017 Local Plan Submission as the main underlying reasons for adding this site to the plan in May 2016 are now defunct.

Supplementary Information provided to Councillors for the GBC Executive Meeting on 11 May 2016, at which A43 Garlick's Arch was very belatedly added to the 2016 Local Plan submission, included the following main reasons for its inclusion instead of the previous site allocation A74 Land around Burnt Common warehouse:
- The site location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site location at Gosden Hill Farm, Merrow Lane, Guildford.

- The site provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to meet identified needs.

As the maximum 7000 sq m industrial/warehousing floorspace included in A43 Garlick's Arch has now been removed from this site allocation in the 2017 Local Plan submission and moved back to the part of the Burnt Common area close to the previous A74 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, though changed to minimum of 7000 sq m, **the above reasons used in 2016 to justify the inclusion of A43 Garlick's Arch in the Local Plan are no longer valid and so A43 Garlick's Arch should be totally removed from the 2017 Local Plan Submission, as well as any future variants that GBC may come up with.**

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation **A43 Garlick's Arch** as point 4.2.20 on page 40 says "National planning policy for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and we will expect all new sites to meet the requirements of national policy. **New pitches and plots should have adequate utility services** and ...."

However, the plan does not include any Utility Infrastructure at all in respect of A43: see 2017 Draft Local Plan Submission Appendix C INFRASTRUCTURE SCHEDULE pages 309-338 and, in particular 2 Utilities pages 320-325, which contains NOTHING in respect of A43 in respect of Electricity and Gas distribution and supply; Water supply; Wastewater connections and treatment; Flood risk reduction : surface water mitigation measures, so "adequate utility services" as required for Travelling Showpeople plots by national Planning Policy for such plots have not been planned for. This is a further reason to remove these plots from A43 Garlick's Arch.

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation **A43 Garlick's Arch** based on the Commentary on A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh contained on page 75 of the 2017 Sustainability Appraisal, which says in respect of A43:

- Strategic Development Site

- There is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need.

**This is a total contradiction** as Policy S2 under 4.1.9 on page 29 includes "Larger Development sites, including the strategic development sites, will deliver the majority of new development in the 6-10 and 11-15 year periods of the plan". The Travelling Showpeople plots cannot be delivered both in the first five years of the plan and "in the 6-10 and 11-15 year periods of the plan".

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation **A43 Garlick's Arch** as the only reason that the commentary in the 2017 Sustainability Appraisal includes "There is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need" is that the Sustainability Appraisal 2016 commentary on site allocation **A46 Land to the south of Normandy and north of Flexford** includes "There is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need" and this site allocation has been removed from the 2017 Draft Plan Submission whilst the area it covers is still there.

I can see no justification for the switch in the plan to A43, especially as A43 is **outside the scope of the GBC policy in respect of Travelling Showpeople plots.**

I object to the addition of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to site allocation **A43 Garlick's Arch** as the Local Plan Submission 2017 shows a total need of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots in the borough during the period of the plan (see Policy S2 page 30 "We will identify 4 permanent pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 4 permanent plots for Travelling Showpeople (as defined by Planning Policy for Traveller Sites) within Guildford borough between 2017 and 2034, Whilst the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople who do not meet the planning definition fall outside this allocation, in order to meet their assessed needs we will seek to provide 41 permanent pitches for for Gypsies and Travellers and 4 permanent plots for Travelling showpeople who do not meet the definition". At the
same time on the site allocation summaries on pages 142-145 Site Allocation A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy on page 145 shows Allocated uses Travelling Showpeople plots (suigeneris) and the column Gross number of homes (approx.) over the plan period shows 14, which is MORE than the total identified need of 8 for the borough and so meaning that that NONE are needed on site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch. The same figure 14 also appeared against A50 under Total number of homes (approx.) for Travelling Showpeople sites in the 2016 draft Local Plan, page 125.

I object to site allocation A43 Garlick's Arch as I strongly object to Requirement (10) under the heading Travelling Showpeople plots "Following completion of the site and a further 18 months of marketing, if the site remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regards to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing" on the following grounds:

a. This "Requirement" is contingent on the Travelling Showpeople site remaining unsold but this should NOT be included in this site allocation in the first place as it is outside the scope of Council Policy on Travelling Showpeople plots.

b. It is totally wrong and unjustified to increase the number of planned homes on this site allocation when the total number of homes in the borough during the period of the plan has been calculated as 1,434 lower than the 2016 draft Local Plan. There is therefore no justification for any future increase on this site.

I object to site allocations A35 Wisley Airfield, A43 Garlick's Arch and A58 Landn around Burnt Common as the scheduled delivery of the important local transport infrastructure developments is unjustifiably late in the process, eg: - A43 Garlick's Arch is stated to be available in the first five years of the plan with 400 homes (0) and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots proposed: "There is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need", 2017 Sustainability Appraisal. - A58 Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send: Land Availability Assessment (2017 Addendum) page 15: "There is a realistic prospect that development will be delivered within the first five years of the Local Plan"; page 16 "Timescale 0-5 years". - SRN 9 and SRN 10, new A3/A247 junctions are stated to be scheduled during the period 2021 to 2027. (Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 page 22).

LRN7 Interventions to address potential highway performance issues resulting from the development at former Wisley Airfield site, including various mitigation schemes to address issues affecting Ripley High Street, A3 Ockham Interchange and M25/A3 Junction 10, are stated to be scheduled for likely delivery during the period 2021 to 2033. (Guildford Borough Transport Strategy 2017 page 23).

It seems ridiculous that the Local Plan is based on developments A43 and A58 taking place or at least begun BEFORE the required improvements to major local transport networks. Unless the major road network improvements take place before the site developments, the Ripley/Send Marsh/Burntcommon/Send/Clandon area will be subject to severe traffic congestion arising from the site developments with very limited access for the vast number of heavy vehicle journeys that will be required which will cause an absolute nightmare for traffic in these villages. It will make Portsmouth Road even more dangerous than it is already at its various junctions.

The addition of new A3/A247 junctions (A43a; SRN9, SRN10) will not help the area of these villages as it will encourage far more traffic to join/leave from the A3 via the A247 meaning much more traffic through Clandon, with its very narrow bends on the A247, and Send in particular, the latter making it more dangerous for pupils, parents and staff at Send Primary School and also more dangerous for both patients and staff at The Villages Medical Centre, as well as local residents and businesses in Send.

Although the draft Local Plan includes reference to the Highways England (HE) Proposed M25/A3 Junction 10 improvement it takes no account of the HE intention to close off access from the A3 northbound onto Wisley Lane, which includes access to RHS Wisley. The HE plan is to only have access to Wisley Lane from a slip road running parallel to A3 northbound, its only access being from the Ockham Interchange (Ockham/Ripley roundabout) which will only be accessible from the southbound A3, with NO ACCESS FROM THE NORTHBOUND A3.

Although HE say that there will be signs on the northbound A3 advising drivers to go to the M25 junction roundabout, turn around and leave the A3 southbound at Ockham Interchange for Wisley/RHS Wisley, human nature being what it is
most such drivers will leave the A3 northbound at London Road B2215 and drive through Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley to get to Ockham Interchange for access to RHS Wisley. So every time an event takes place at RHS Wisley we can expect even worse traffic congestion through Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley which makes the building of 400 homes at Garlick's Arch on Portsmouth Road even less appropriate, and Travelling Showpeople with heavy vehicles for fairground equipment an even bigger mistake. A43 Garlick's Arch should be removed from the Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3130  Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq. m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning?

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3131  Respondent: 15439425 / Abigail Cruse  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3155  Respondent: 15440161 / Linda Daniell  Agent:
2. I object to Policy A43 Garlicks Arch and the building of 400 houses and industrial space and new road junction. Having been a resident of Send for 20 years and previously a teacher at the First School for 10 years, I am aware of the impact this would have on both the schools and traffic. Because of its proximity to the A3 and M25, there have always been recurring difficulties with congestion on the road through Send at peak times. Any incidents on major roads causes huge queues in the village. This has implications for people getting to work and school. When I taught at the school, it was not uncommon for children and staff to be delayed in reaching school following accidents. This would only be exacerbated by increasing the population in this area. Additionally, I object to the destruction of ancient woodland and the loss of natural habitats this would cause. I do see any disclosure of detailed calculations as to the number of new houses Guildford requires. This should be transparent before we consider using Green belt land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4687</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442049 / Ellouise Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.
21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3212</th>
<th>Respondent: 15442081 / Lauren Fassom</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3226  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses at Garlick’s Arch. These are not needed in Send or the borough and the proposal was announced at the last minute without any prior consultation.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch. It is not needed and there is already an available site at Slyfield where it can be built.

I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch because the site is home to ancient woodland which should be conserved and it is also subject to flooding.

I object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch as it is part of the Green Belt and helps stop merging of towns and settlements. This is the main purpose of the Green Belt. I believe it needs to stay as such

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3952  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh for the following reasons:

1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.
2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.
3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever be regained.
4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.
6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.
7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.
8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.
9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3955  Respondent: 15442561 / Tegan Meredith  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3237  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/314  Respondent: 15442785 / Tammy Hoar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because

1. It ignores the thousands of previous objections previously made by local people.
2. There is absolutely no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople at this location.
3. It will cause chaos where it accesses the Portsmouth Road.
4. It is ancient woodland and shows the contempt the GBC demonstrates for the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3248  Respondent: 15442913 / Inger Scotland  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

21. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the Draft Plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council may have been attracted by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding should be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so-called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running South past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for Southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4).

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a).

The addition of North facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would have serious repercussions for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the North, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the East of Guildford (Merrow etc.) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas, as the traffic would be on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3261  Respondent: 15443265 / C Knaggs  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

3) I object to the plans at Garlicks Arch. It would ruin the whole area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3273  Respondent: 15445729 / Daren Aris  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the development at Garlicks Arch. There is ancient woodland and it is a flood plain.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3277  Respondent: 15445793 / Jackie Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/317</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446561 / Peter Hoar</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It ignores the thousands of previous objections previously made by loclal people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is absolutely no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople at this location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It will cause chaos where it accesses the Portsmouth Road.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is ancient woodland and shows the contempt the GBC demonstrates for the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3306</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446689 / James Eric Barr</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to the building of 400 houses and 7000sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, the ste of ancient woodland. There are already industrial estates elsewhere with space to develop and the roads through Send and Ripley are choked with traffic morning and late afternoon now without adding to the misery. To us it would be sensible to have northbound access to the A3 at Burnt Common to reduce the amount of traffic travelling through Ripley villlage to get to the A3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/683</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446689 / James Eric Barr</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it ignores the thousands of previous objections, the provision of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots is out of proportion, the number of houses is excessive and will cause the loss of ancient woodland, might exacerbate flooding in the area and will generate excessive traffic on roads and villages which cannot cope with the present volume of traffic at peak times. We are retired so don't travel to work during rush hour but if we have a doctor's appointment the volume of traffic has a significant impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3318</th>
<th>Respondent: 15446753 / David Boyce</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it ignores the thousands of previous objections, the provision of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots is out of proportion, the number of houses is excessive and will cause the loss of ancient woodland, might exacerbate flooding in the area and will generate excessive traffic on roads and villages which cannot cope with the present volume of traffic at peak times. We are retired so don't travel to work during rush hour but if we have a doctor's appointment the volume of traffic has a significant impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2) and therefore GBC is acting outside their terms of reference.

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of this habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:

   i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
   
   ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

1. I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT TO 400 HOUSES and 7000 sq METRES OF INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT GARLICKS ARCH ,opposite Send Marsh RoadThe site floods and is covered by ancient woodland.The industrial space could be comfortably located elsewhere for example Slyfield.There seems no desire to explore and develop brownfield sites.Again this would put more pressure on traffic with an escalation in the number of motor accidents.Having lived in Potters Lane for 20 years I have already witnessed this increase.On one evening there were 4 accidents outside my home at the bottom of Potters lane within the space of an hour.The river Wey is more prone to flooding.Road water runoff now more prevalent.Access onto and ingress from A3 is particularly dangerous.this road should be closed.discussions with the police suggest they are very supportive of this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: 4.jpg (53 KB), 2.jpg (113 KB), 1.jpg (88 KB), 3.jpg (34 KB)
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5423  **Respondent:** 15448289 / Paul Miller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3350  **Respondent:** 15448321 / Nicole Mapplebeck  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), **is Sound?** ( ), **is Legally Compliant?** ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.
The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for putting houses on this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for...
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3353  Respondent: 15448385 / Edward Bates  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4556  Respondent: 15448385 / Edward Bates  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3356</th>
<th>Respondent: 15448449 / Carol Roberts</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham...
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3369  Respondent: 15448897 / Ruth Brothwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I **object** to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Please see below for detailed reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3669  Respondent: 15448897 / Ruth Brothwell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I **object** to the policy A43 very strongly.

I wish our village to remain in the Green Belt and I cannot see any 'exceptional circumstances' which might enable the council to consider removing us. Living here and purchasing a home here was because of the Green Belt protection to our wonderful countryside. Ripley and Send/Burnt Common are distinct village areas. This proposal tries to link them up resulting in a semi-urban sprawl which goes against the policy of the Green Belt.

Local villagers have already made strong objections which appear to have been ignored! There is no proven demand for Travellers plots in this location.

The number of houses proposed for our village needs is excessive and will cause huge over development of our area. The road networks are already extremely busy and this proposal will result in a huge increase of traffic. Local roads and junctions with the main A3 simply will not cope with the extra influx. Additional traffic jams will result causing untold delays and inconvenience to people trying to commute to London or deliver children to local schools.

The area is subject to flooding (it is currently a flood zone 2 area) - further development will only make matters worse.

The area in question has been used over many years for shooting and the land is contaminated by lead shot.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3412  Respondent: 15449697 / Kevin Hewton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like to register my objection to the above planning application in and around Send / Ripley

My objection is based on

1. Over density of New Houses
2. The local schools do not have the capacity to take in all the expected children
3. Send Surgery is already oversubscribed making it difficult to get an appointment, additional residents would exasperate this
4. The traffic through Send and Ripley already causes gridlock at certain times of the day additional vehicles would again exasperate this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3417  Respondent: 15449857 / Fiona Cumberland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3418  Respondent: 15449857 / Fiona Cumberland  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3420  Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3421</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449889 / Harriet Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3424</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449921 / James Herbst</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sqm of Industrial space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send marsh Road. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Slyfield also has many vacant industrial units.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3437</th>
<th>Respondent: 15449985 / Elizabeth Mead</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please ensure that my letter is shown to the government inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy (A4 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A247 cannot be widened to take more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air quality and noise level for house holders along the A247 must also be considered

Our local Send Surgery (which is my local surgery also) cannot accommodate more patients.

Our local schools are also filled to capacity.

In 2014 the council rejected a planning application from Oldlands to build 25 houses on very sound planning grounds, so now, how is an application to build 400 houses and 7.000sq metres of industrial buildings even being considered?

Residents in Send, Ripley and West Clandon purchased their properties in villages because all are surrounded by Green Belt.

As ratepayers of Guildford Borough Council, they cannot have this Green Belt destroyed and should be more protected in line with the current government policy by their Council.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3461</th>
<th>Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3463</th>
<th>Respondent: 15450785 / Georgina Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)**

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch. There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that has the capacity to fulfill the need. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3478</th>
<th>Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3481</td>
<td>Respondent: 15451009 / Michael Love</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and, confusingly, replaced it with a site at Garlick’s Arch. This proposed site is not appropriate because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is liable to flooding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no plans to improve local schools, doctors or other local amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3483</th>
<th>Respondent: 15451041 / Iain Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch. There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that has the capacity to fulfil the need. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3485</th>
<th>Respondent: 15451041 / Iain Bell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3489  Respondent: 15451457 / Camilla Bell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites.

Development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3506  Respondent: 15451905 / Jonathan Withers  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3511  Respondent: 15451969 / Rosie Lee  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Page 1097 of 1552
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3601  Respondent: 15454593 / Jack Dadswell  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3598  Respondent: 15454657 / Tracy McGuigan  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3594  Respondent: 15454881 / Mark Fielder  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6787  Respondent: 15454881 / Mark Fielder  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick's Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. As stated by central government policy, the need for new housing is not accepted as an exceptional circumstance as such the stated areas should not be removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3593  Respondent: 15454913 / A Burston  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley.
Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/3592</td>
<td>15454945 / Claire Cassar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/3563</td>
<td>15454977 / Graham Hook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as it is classed as a Green Belt area. As stated by central government policy, the need for archnew housing is not accepted as an exceptional circumstance. Consequently, Garlick’s should not be removed from the Green Belt (Policy P2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLPS16/6907</td>
<td>15454945 / Claire Cassar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( ), is Sound?</td>
<td>( ), is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the proposed site 43 at Garlicks Arch. As a local resident of Send Marsh for 30 years and born in West Clandon before that, I have seen a lot of changes to the area along with the increased traffic. The proposal to build 400 houses along with industrial and offices on this site is beyond belief. The area is not the right place to put industrial units, and are they really needed. If they really are needed it would be best if they were kept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
together with existing areas. The development of the housing alone would lead to the increase in traffic along the Portsmouth and the Send Marsh road junction and surrounding roads will lead to nothing more than total congestion. As for the proposed new slip roads for the A3 this will only compound the traffic issues for the surrounding roads and make it impossible. The queues at the Send Marsh road, Portsmouth road junction in the mornings along with other times of the days and even weekends is getting worse and worse as it is, without adding more cars, 2 per household on average, 800 plus commercial vehicles, ok not all at the same time but peak times will be horrific. Add to that the increased noise, (it never seems to be quite now,) along with added pollution it just gets worse and worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3591  Respondent: 15455009 / Emma Graham  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3590  Respondent: 15455073 / Amanda Fletcher  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
The impact on Send village of such a disproportionately-sized development would be very negative and would permanently alter the fabric of the village and community. The infrastructure and amenities would not be able to cope with such a development and there is clearly no plan to develop them.

The Garlick's Arch site is in the green belt and so should be off limits to development. Aside from that though, it is in a flood zone and so is in any case unsuitable for development.

I appreciate that houses and industrial units are needed in the area but I would ask that the council prioritises existing brownfield sites before destroying the green belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3710  Respondent: 15457505 / Julie Gray  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to this proposal.

How could this proposal have been such a last minute thought? It is such a large development I have no confidence that the implications of it have been thought through. If it is not a last minute thought then why have we not been informed of it before? It is highly suspicious, surely it cannot be legal to deprive us of a full length consultation period?

This plot of land creates an important buffer between Send Marsh and the A3 and also prevents the village of Send merging with Clandon.

What are the special circumstances that would allow 400 houses to be built on this flood prone, Green Belt with ancient woodland, when the housing numbers that we have been told we need are highly questionable?

Why do we need 700 square metres of more industrial space when GBC has failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) which shows an 80% reduction in employment space from the previous ELNA carried out by GBC in 2013.

This proposal would be right next to the A3. So again air quality for those living in the 400 houses should be questioned. Building sound proofing bunds does not protect the inhabitants from air pollution.

The high density housing and industry would also add to the already congested A3, M25 and A247. In addition to developments proposed at Wisley and Gosden Hill Farm. It would also create a huge burden on our other facilities e.g. schools and medical centre.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3739  Respondent: 15458081 / K C Meldrum  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies A43 and 43A- I object to the inclusion of A43 as the site is a flood risk and to A43A on the basis that there must be a 4 way junction north of Potters Lane at Gosden Hill Farm and therefore there is no need for slip roads onto the A3 at Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3756  Respondent: 15459297 / Mark Murphy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 Houses and 7000 square meters of industrial Space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road.
This is Green Belt Land with Ancient Woodland, and is prone to considerable flooding. The industrial space is definitely not needed as there is adequate space at Slyfield Green, and the owners at Slyfield are keen to have extra use there if there is in fact a need at all for extra industrial Space.

If GBC used the brownfield sites this Green Belt land would not be needed.

The gridlock that this development would cause on the local Roads would make the already overly congested and busy roads impassable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4213  Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)
There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.
The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4215  Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4216  Respondent: 15460353 / Elizabeth Hewlett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7893  **Respondent:** 15460737 / Donna Collinson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

See comments on questions 1 to 3

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3794  **Respondent:** 15461025 / Philip Masters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Garlicks Arch development on the grounds that the proposal for 400 new homes and an industrial site would lead to overdevelopment in a conservation area.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/3796  **Respondent:** 15461153 / Lynda Masters  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed development of 400 homes and an industrial development at Garlick's Arch on the grounds that the noise and extra traffic from an already busy A3 would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding villages and its residents. The A3 already suffers from gridlock at certain times of the week and if there should be an accident, of which there are many on the A3, the subsequent closure of the A3 leads to chaos on the surrounding roads causing tailbacks through West Clandon, Chilworth and Ripley and Send.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the development on the grounds that Garlick's Arch provides a buffer to residents against Noise and pollution and as it is covered in ancient woodland, should be conserved.

I object on the grounds that the busy A3 leads directly to the Royal Surrey Hospital and any gridlock, closures or delays on this busy road, could cause potential loss of life if ambulances are not able to get to the hospital.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I further object on the grounds that 400 homes on one site is excessive and will put further strain on hospital services, Medical Centres, schools and general services. Send, Ripley and Clandon are rural and should remain that way. Any development should be moderate to meet requirements and not excessive to line the pockets of greedy developers.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the change to Policy A43 Land at Garlick’s Arch as it not only ignores previous objections to the number of proposed houses, but adds 6 Travelling Showpeople plots, for which there is no proven demand in this area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3831  Respondent: 15461633 / Anna Wood  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1579  Respondent: 15461761 / K.J. Pullen  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

It appears from the changes you have made to the proposal for homes and Travellers plots that you have totally ignored the numerous pervious objections which were made by local people. Exactly what are the 'exceptional circumstances' that you claim exist? A clear definition of these would be helpful, please? Six Travellers plots is excessive as there is no proven demand for any whatsoever in this locality. Garlick's arch is a permanent piece of ancient woodland from the 16th century. Apart from the loss of this unique area of woodland and the fact that Ripley and Send will effectively be joined and therefore defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt, this area is subject to frequent flooding and has been given a 'Flood Zone 2' designation.

This revised plan for 400 homes will cause an immense over-development of our village and the removal of a flood plain. Will our doctors surgeries be able to cope with the demand from the proposed number of new residents or the local schools be able to offer places for children. Very importantly, would the roads be able to cater with the additional traffic, which would be excessive. Your changed plans would cause heavy traffic for many hours each day and queues that would stretch from 'Old Woking' to the M25. You must be aware of the current state of affairs of near gridlock on all roads in the area at least twice daily.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3861  Respondent: 15462017 / Kevin Rhoades  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
6. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3865</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462017 / Kevin Rhoades</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq. m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3889</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the local plan based on the impact it will have on the special countryside of the borough.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3891</th>
<th>Respondent: 15462785 / Thomas McMinn</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?

There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. Development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/164  Respondent: 15463009 / P M Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Site A43 Garlicks Arch
I object to the increase in houses to a figure over 600. I further object to the provision for Travelling Showpeople Plots,
which would obviously involve the use of articulated lorries and other transportation vehicles. These would be wholly
unsuitable in this area, especially when accessing on to the B2215 road. The proposed inclusion of these plots is out of
line with the original plan and is in a Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2761  Respondent: 15463009 / P M Proctor  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I object to the increase in houses to a figure over 600.

I further object to the provision for Travelling Showpeople Plots, which would obviously involve the use of articulated
lorries and other transportation vehicles. These would be wholly unsuitable in this area, especially when accessing on to
the B2215 road. The proposed inclusion of these plots is out of line with the original plan and is in a Green Belt area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3929  Respondent: 15464673 / Trudy Grey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

21. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a
shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars
for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will
cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this
important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be
used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling
development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory
purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of
this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport.

With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
1. POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4505  Respondent: 15466209 / Janet Parry-Morris  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Over-large sites in rural locations

The inclusion of over-large housing, industrial and warehouse developments in the plan, such as Garlick’s Arch, would have a detrimental impact on the villages of Send and Ripley and the local community. I object to the allocation of land to the Garlick’s Arch development as it would have a detrimental impact on the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3978  Respondent: 15468097 / Allan Hempstead  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)

Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity

** I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)

There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose

** I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4)

The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years

** I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3994</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468417 / A B Buchanan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the development at Garlick's Arch. The land is Green Belt and there are no 'exceptional circumstances' which would justify this use of Green Belt land. It is inappropriate, unjustified, and represents an over intensive development on Green Belt.

There are far more appropriate brown field sites nearby for the industrial development (should it be required) and meet housing needs without plundering Green Belt land.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/3992</th>
<th>Respondent: 15468609 / Lesley Lane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4)**

The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlick's Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years.

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)**

Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity.

**I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)**

There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/3998  Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000sq metres of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. This was sprung on the village at the last moment, only 2 weeks notice and without any prior consultation.

The infrastructure requirements have not been properly considered and are inadequate to deal with the proposed housing levels. Our roads, doctors and schools will be unable to cope. Industrial space is not needed and if it was could be accommodated on the Slyfield industrial estate.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3658  Respondent: 15468705 / Pauline East  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people, this is a beautiful permanent Green Belt area and the number of houses proposed is excessive and increased traffic will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley. Also there is no proven demand for Traveller Showpeople plots in this location.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4005  Respondent: 15468833 / Zoe Kollov  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I vehemently object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. I have just moved away from the Slyfield industrial estate to an area that I am assured by law cannot be touched for such purposes. We have paid a very hefty premium for the privilege of living in such a place, and will continue to pay the mortgage for many, many years to come. The site floods and is also ancient woodland that needs protection for the generations to come. If industrial space is needed it should be cited with the existing in Slyfield where we have just moved away from. We have been shown no calculations of Guildford housing requirement calculations so there is no basis to plan for the huge number of addition houses being suggested. I also object to the accelerated way these proposals were pushed forward with the hope of the local community not having time to Object.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:

- I do not see any exceptional circumstances that should force the erosion of green belt land
- It will remove the 'green belt' between Ripley and Send that is necessary for the survival of our native species such as Hedgehogs
- It will generate further traffic that will clog up the area to the detriment of all those currently living here
- A further 400 homes will put further pressure on local services, which are currently at breaking point; transportation, hospitals, education etc.
- There is no proven requirement for travelling show people plots
- It will spoil the current beauty and openness of the area, which is what attracted my family and I in the first place.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I would like to voice my objections as a Send resident to the following elements of the local plan:

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses at Garlick's Arch along with the proposed 7000 meters of industrial space. This is a site that floods and the calculations for the need such a large housing development has to my knowledge not been disclosed. This is a new site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. The local infrastructure cannot support such an increase in local residents. Overstretched schools and medical centre will not be able to cope with such developments.

Slyfield offers a much better site for industrial development - if needed at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

a) It will link Ripley and Send with no green buffer between the 2 villages.
b) Again there is no consideration of the thousands of previous objections to this proposal from local residents and the increase in numbers of houses to 400 is massively excessive.

c) It is an inappropriate site on account of frequent flooding and it represents a rare piece of ancient woodland which should be conserved and not destroyed.

d) Excessive traffic will again be generated on the Old Portsmouth Road which is already very busy (especially when there is a blockage on the A3). Ripley and Send come to a standstill with the current overflow traffic from the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4037  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This area contains an ancient woodland and to develop it would be an environmental disaster effecting wildlife and destruction of many species. The area is prone to flooding which would increase, plus pollution. 400 houses has the potential for another 800 cars on the road and this coupled with lorries, vans etc to serve industrial units who would either travel through Ripley and Send, - a rush hour nightmare. This is turning our villages into urban areas and is contrary to Green Belt regulations.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2931  Respondent: 15469217 / L.Y. Jolliffe  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch. Send Marsh.

I object to the addition of eight travelling/show people pitches.

a) There is NO demand for these pitches in this area.

b) There is NO legal requirement for this provision - Guildfords's own 'drop-in event describes this provision as "Sui generis". Translated it means to hinillier a generous gesture.

c) The local plan policy states "Gypsy, traveller or travelling show people accommodation should only be provided on development sites of 500+ homes NOT 400

d) The council has ignored thousands of objections to the proposal for 400 houses on this site. The impact on both Ripley & Send in terms of traffic jams. insufficient intiastructure and services.

e) The site is Ancient woodland and permanent Green Belt of historical interest which should not be de-classified. There is NO justification that would meet the criteria of "Exceptional circumstances."

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4029  Respondent: 15469249 / Daniel Harris  Agent:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the sustainable employment policy (Policy E1)

If developed, the new employment site at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common (A43), would be treated as a Strategic Employment Site.

The proposed development of up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in the scheme of industrial development relatively small. Just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m. The Garlick’s Arch site which is in the Green Belt should not be developed as a Strategic Employment Site when there is a suitable alternative brownfield site very close by, which is far more sustainable.

I OBJECT to the location for new employment floorspace at Garlick’s Arch – Site A43 (Policy E2)

Proposals for new industrial, warehousing and storage (use Class B1c, B2 and B8) floorspace will be directed to the Industrial Strategic Employment Sites.

There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Garlick’s Arch, when just to the south of the site at Burnt Common there is an existing industrial development, with ample surplus land that could accommodate a further development of 7,000 sq m.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4072  Respondent: 15470145 / Linda Eyre  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2)

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4078  Respondent: 15472097 / Bernard Eyre  Agent: 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2)

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition, there are regular sightings of badgers, deer, and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour, no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4091  Respondent: 15472833 / Lorraine Ozanne  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch – Slyfield is a better place for such industrial space. This Green belt site should not be needed if brownfield sites are properly used.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4118  Respondent: 15473473 / Gordon Prosser  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 in that the proposed industrial development of 7000 sq m is simply not required. In addition, any proposal to have a traffic interchange (4 way) onto the A3 at Burnt Common would lead to impossible numbers of HGV’s etc, and Send is already overburdened with traffic from 6 am to 7 pm on weekdays.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4129  Respondent: 15473729 / Barrie and Jenny Kelly  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I also object to the developments a43, a44, a43a for the same reasons.
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Glandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here. The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Glandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians. The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. (Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford. Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution.
Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3). If the stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4). It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1). Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of 'through' traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. "Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4775  Respondent: 15474849 / Timothy Yorath  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of the flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the Character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4155  Respondent: 15475297 / Jane Patricia Chandler  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7087</th>
<th>Respondent: 15478209 / Sally Daboo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car. The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/2025</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15478209 / Sally Daboo</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the Green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well, I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over nine years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no uncertainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 and M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick’s Arch site will cause coalescence with
Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5558  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no
prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and
within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick’s Arch site was substituted at the last minute on
24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield
site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100
homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt
Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with
Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1819  Respondent: 15479681 / George Smith  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances
for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

1. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site
according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks
Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section
4.2.24 of the Plan.

1. I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of
the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
1. a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) than the Burnt Common site did”

2. b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4327  Respondent: 15479777 / Alexandra Trebilco  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4328  Respondent: 15479809 / James Trebilco  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4332  Respondent: 15479905 / K Dormer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent. What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4347  Respondent: 15480417 / J Chequer  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4348  Respondent: 15480449 / A D R Lewis  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4349  Respondent: 15480513 / Janet Graham  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4350</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480545 / L Graham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4368</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480609 / R E Jones</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4370</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480641 / Gillian Battams</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4371</th>
<th>Respondent: 15480769 / Caroline Battams</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4381  Respondent: 15481217 / C R Avery  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to new sites (Garlicks Arch) being introduced as an afterthought when it was not even considered in the previous plan. A slip road on the A3 at Burnt Common has been added to the Draft Local Plan without Highways England consent.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4313  Respondent: 15481409 / Amy F Corstin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.
This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/4391</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15482817 / C.E. Pullen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
**I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4) The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years**

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.**

**I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3) Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity**

**I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C) There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose**

**I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5) The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.**

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**I object very strongly to the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2016).**

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley**

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt. Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

**I object to the Local Plan as the development proposed is not sustainable**

13,860 new houses proposed is not sustainable – it will damage local communities by over development, especially Ripley, Send and Clandon. The local communities don’t need these houses. Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) have no railway stations and inadequate bus services, so almost every adult will have to have a car. The Plan has nothing to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch.

The development should be in urban areas where there is sustainable transport.

**I object to not protecting the Green Belt**

I object to removing Ripley, Send and Clandon from the Green Belt, together with sites of Wisley Airfield (A35) and Garlick’s Arch (A43) and the resulting urban sprawl. There are **no exceptional circumstances** for these villages and sites being removed, as required by the National Planning Policy.

The Plan should develop the existing **brownfield** site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch (A43).

**I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1)**

There is too much traffic in our villages already and this plan will cause more congestion in Ripley, Send and Clandon, with no plan to improve that.

The rural roads in this area are narrow, in poor condition and have no footpaths. 5000 more houses means dangerous and unsustainable traffic.

**I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development**

The Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposal would double the built area in the locality, and would irrevocably damage the character of the Ancient Woodland on the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

**I object to poor air quality concerns**

The huge developments being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion and to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

**I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites**

The Plan does not identify adequate infrastructure improvements to support the huge scale of development, especially at Garlick’s Arch (A43) which has no infrastructure projects in the Infrastructure Schedule to support it. Local services, utilities and sewerage, doctors etc. are at or close to capacity.

There are no plans to improve the capability of the medical and police/emergency services to cover the 5000+ houses in the north east of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4410  **Respondent:** 15483713 / Claire Walker  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: Strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4413  Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: spslp172/4471  Respondent: 15483713 / Claire Walker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4418   Respondent: 15484033 / Caroline Ali   Agent:  

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4)

The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

** I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)

Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity

** I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C)

There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose
** I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4434  Respondent: 15485281 / Fiona Stobart  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4436  Respondent: 15485345 / Ruth Beavington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)
There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4446  Respondent: 15485345 / Ruth Beavington  Agent:
**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

---

1. **I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**
   Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

   The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

   The site is not appropriate because:
   - There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
   - The site is liable to frequent flooding
   - It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
   - There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)
There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

1. I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch in Green Belt and ancient Woodlands.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

SITE A43 GARLICKS ARCH

The revised plan is increasing the number of homes to a minimum of 400 on what is Greenbelt Land. This and other proposed developments in the north of the borough is in danger of harming the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Send, Ripley, and Clandon.

Inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots and associated storage facilities is totally inappropriate in a rural environment in Greenbelt land. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature]. There is no identified need within the Local Plan document for this allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to a Local Plan which does not consider flooding risks (Garlick’s Arch)
- I object to a Local Plan which seeks to decimate ancient woodland (Garlick’s Arch)
- I object to a Local Plan which does not consider the impact upon wildlife (Garlick’s Arch)
- I object to a Local Plan which seeks to include industrial usage on a greenbelt site (Garlick’s Arch) rather than using a Brownfield site (Burnt Common)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4496  Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to a Local Plan which includes 400 houses and 7,000 sq feet of industrial usage (A43) in an area where only recently you correctly turned down an application for only 25 houses. Housing Need is not an exceptional circumstance which justifies the removal of land from the Green Belt. Simply because a Landowner and a Developer are seeking to make millions of pounds profit – that greed is not an exceptional circumstance which justifies the removal of land from the Green Belt. Neither is there an exception circumstance justified when those said Land owners and developers effectively offer a bribe of paying for the ramps to the A3 (A43A). On every moral and ethical test this is not something which can be justified and should be removed from the Local Plan.

I trust that you will consider all of the objections which I have raised above. That you will determine that all my objections are reasonable and as a consequence you will accept that the Local Plan, as currently written, is flawed and requires significant amendments before being presented again.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2160  Respondent: 15486017 / Neil Higgins  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4493  Respondent: 15486049 / Ceri Schooling  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites
I object to the lack of infrastructure for sites like Garlick’s Arch. Where are the residents going to school and what GP surgery will they belong to?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4499  Respondent: 15486081 / Rosie Ainsworth  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substitute at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4510  Respondent: 15486177 / Daniel Peyton  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4520  Respondent: 15486305 / Noel Ainsworth  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4537  Respondent: 15486849 / Eric Waestaff  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4574  Respondent: 15486881 / Mark Langton  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4575</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486913 / Sarah Langton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4576</th>
<th>Respondent: 15486945 / J Hazelton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4561</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487233 / Lindsey Schravetta</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4587</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487265 / Helen Smith</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4565</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487297 / L.A. Crane</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4586</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487329 / Adam Sadler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4585</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487361 / Roger Dean</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Document page number** | 1714 | **Page page number** | 1165 | **Section page number** | 1714 |
Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4584  Respondent: 15487393 / Nicola Ford  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4583  Respondent: 15487425 / B Pryor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4582  Respondent: 15487457 / Aidan Beckett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4581  Respondent: 15487489 / Luke Draper  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4580  Respondent: 15487553 / Nicholas Eager  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4579</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487585 / Debbie Eggleton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4578</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487617 / C Sheriff</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4577</th>
<th>Respondent: 15487649 / Paul Adams</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong></td>
<td>( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4640  **Respondent:** 15488065 / Heather Beaver  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4651  **Respondent:** 15488193 / Tracey Butler  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/4664  **Respondent:** 15494977 / Carol Adams  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4677  | Respondent: 15495041 / J D Clarkson  | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I understand the owners of Garlick's Arch are gifting the land for these new slip roads. What the plan does not make clear is that Policies A43 and A43a are actually inter-dependent in that the gifting of this land is dependent on the owner's receiving planning consent for housing.

The Garlick's Arch site has a number of problems with it that will, in no doubt, lead to lengthy delays in its development. For example the site is in Flood Zone 3, the existence of four pylons on site and the ancient woodland.

The Garlick's Arch site was included in the Plan at the twelfth hour- it has not been the subject of the rigorous scrutiny that has been applied to all other sites. I cannot understand why it was a last minute replacement for another site, Burnt Common, that has been the subject of prior development as it already has on it three industrial units. Furthermore this site was previously highlighted as important in meeting the industrial needs of the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: PSLPS16/4692  | Respondent: 15495201 / Viliv Viana  | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.
I would like to object to the below proposed new developments for the below reasons. We accept that extra housing is needed, but it is important to get the numbers and locations right, which based on my objections below does not seem to be happening.

Please can my below comments be shown to the Planning Inspector who will make the decision. Please also send an email receipt that this has been received.

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlick's Arch, opposite Send March Road. This will create unsustainable amounts of traffic on the already extremely busy Send March Road and Portsmouth Road. My busiest part of my journey to work in the morning is getting from Send March Road onto Portsmouth Road, and the queue of traffic is often down as far as the Saddlers Arms pub. It will become impossible to get onto Portsmouth Road with any additional houses or industrial space.

In addition, the site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford's housing requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4736  Respondent: 15495361 / Therese Elizabeth Hill  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4868  Respondent: 15495393 / M Rendell  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and
an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4875  Respondent: 15495457 / R Laroche  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4743  Respondent: 15495489 / Stephen Hill  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3268</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495873 / Gerard Duvé</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A43 – Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the removal of this site from Green Belt. It was included at the last minute in the 2016 draft, without justification other than the proposed A3 slip roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the proposal of travelling showmen as Ripley already has 4 travellers pitches, with more are proposed on site A35.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4888</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495905 / Emma Marshall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4767</th>
<th>Respondent: 15495937 / C Aruncel</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4891  Respondent: 15496033 / Sophie Hart  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4782  Respondent: 15496129 / Ella Doyle  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4894  Respondent: 15496193 / Oliver Hemmings  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of
Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4897  Respondent: 15496225 / Tasha Hemmings  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4904  Respondent: 15496257 / Charlotte Philipps  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4905  Respondent: 15496289 / W.A. McGregor  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4843</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496481 / R Frampton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4850</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496545 / Gillian Frampton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4812</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496609 / Dena Parker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4862</th>
<th>Respondent: 15496993 / nigel stirraker</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4851</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497057 / S McMarken</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 land at Burnt Common Ware house which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4838</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497377 / David Freeborough</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4855</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497537 / Caroline Sheppard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4863  Respondent: 15497601 / Ben Hicks  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4883  Respondent: 15497761 / N Wadey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4889  Respondent: 15497857 / Elisabeth A Hawkey  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposal for the development of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43). 400 homes and an industrial unit are not wanted. Industrial, commercial and personal vehicles will increase traffic beyond an acceptable level for the area. Access roads at Burnt Common are not wanted.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4900</th>
<th>Respondent: 15497889 / Hugo Wadey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4909</td>
<td>Respondent: 15497953 / Rebecca Dougherty</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: PSLPS16/4916</td>
<td>Respondent: 15498049 / Natasha Howard</td>
<td>Agent:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4933  Respondent: 15498241 / Faye Church  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4943  Respondent: 15498369 / Kris Steadman  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/4967  Respondent: 15498785 / Catherine Elingworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5002  Respondent: 15499873 / Pan Illingworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5017  Respondent: 15500065 / Rachael Illingworth  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5084  Respondent: 15500161 / Joanna Scott  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14) Why not?

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Some of my friends have struggled to get school places as it is!
Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5030  **Respondent:** 15500513 / Alex Illingworth  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5039  **Respondent:** 15500801 / Morgan Schooling  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5051  **Respondent:** 15501217 / Luke Sarti  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

---
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5092  Respondent: 15502177 / Steve Plewis  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5308  Respondent: 15502209 / Shirley Atkinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham...
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/5309</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15502209 / Shirley Atkinson</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and redkites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5307  Respondent: 15502241 / Richard Atkinson  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)
The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick's Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5310  Respondent: 15502241 / Richard Atkinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and redkites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5098  Respondent: 15502305 / S. Gibbs  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5102  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to a new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because Send would have to take traffic from the proposed 2000 houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 at Gosden Hill and 1850 at Blackwell Farm as well as 485 from Send itself. This is in addition to what it takes at the moment. Much of this traffic to and fro the A3, M25, Woking and
Guildford would go through Send. Send Road, which is already overloaded, would face gridlock. This would exacerbate noise and pollution levels which are already excessive and is wholly unacceptable.

I OBJECT to the new interchange with the A3 at Burnt Common because it is being presented as a way of facilitating the movement of a massive increase in vehicles whereas in reality it would cause havoc on the A247 and the many feeder roads in Ripley and Clandon in addition to Send.

I OBJECT to the fact that Guildford Councillors approved the Local Plan before the Transport Assessment had even been published which indicates what scant regard they had for the traffic implications which are at the forefront of residents’ worries. They have to contend with the problem every day in terms of delays, pollution and noise which are already destroying our villages as decent places in which to live.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7867  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 Houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial Space at Garlicks Arch opposite Send Marsh Road. This is Green Belt Land with Ancient Woodland, and is prone to considerable flooding. The industrial space is definitely not needed as there is adequate space at Slyfield Green, and the owners at Slyfield are keen to have extra use there. You do not in fact need at all extra industrial Space.
If GBC used the brownfield sites this Green Belt land would not be needed.
The gridlock that this development would cause on the local Roads would be in addition to the congestion that there already exists around this area and getting the developers to bribe SCC with a new junction will only add to the congestion by pulling in extra traffic trying to access the A3.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3571  Respondent: 15502433 / Jill Murphy  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO POLICY A 43 because:
It ignores thousands of previous objections made by us local people.
It will cause even more traffic congestion, which is dreadful already, gridlocking the Roads in and out of Send and Ripley.
It will fill in the gap between Send Marsh and Ripley, so defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.
It will cause over development of our village and this number of homes is excessive.
There are NO "exceptional circumstances" existing to use our precious, beautiful Green Belt Land.
The beautiful Ancient Woodland in this site has been there since Elizabeth the First and must be protected for future generations.

Being a flood zone 2 allocation it is prone to frequent flooding, so the surface water will be moved onto the lower ground where I live.

There is a clay pigeon shooting site here which has polluted the ground with lead shot for over 50 years.

There is NO PROVEN demand for Traveling Show people plots here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5116  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance. What will happen for doctors, dentists and schools? It is bad enough already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5119  Respondent: 15502817 / Linda Margaret Cutbush  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)
Why is it deemed necessary for a new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of existing successful rural businesses, which have been there for decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy (A43 Garlick's Arch) and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5165  Respondent: 15503169 / A Palitchell  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5179  Respondent: 15503361 / James Pasfield  Agent:  
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1946</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503457 / Patrick Lea</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition I object to A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it ignores the many previous objections made by local residents and will generate significantly more traffic without the requisite infrastructure being put in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5201</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503585 / B Powell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5213</th>
<th>Respondent: 15503617 / Stephen Roy</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Sound?</strong> ( ), <strong>is Legally Compliant?</strong> ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.
The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5243</th>
<th>Respondent: 15504129 / Simon Hurdle</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy A43 - Garlick’s Arch

I object -

1) This is land is Green Belt - designed to prevent sprawl and the merging of settlements. No ‘exceptional circumstances’ have been claimed – indeed there has been little time to address this or the other issues below. This site was not in the 2014 Section 18 original draft Local Plan, not the revised Section 19 Local Plan in April 2016, and appeared just thirteen days before the Council met to recommend consultation – a poor way to make large decisions.

2) The development is too large – the proposal for 400 homes plus light industrial facilities represent an increase of about a quarter the size of Send village. People living there will use the Send schools and the Send-based Villages Medical Centre which serves Send and Ripley. These are currently working at capacity. 400 homes at Garlick’s Arch would provide too many patients and pupils for present arrangements, and not enough to make feasible the building of a new school or new medical facilities.

3) The proposed new links to the A3 would mean a large increase in traffic through Send and at the Burnt Common Roundabout; these road are already jammed at times. It is claimed that it is not permitted to link the Garlick’s Arch directly to the A3, so traffic to and from the site would use the narrow Burnt Common Lane, the Portsmouth Road, Burnt Common Roundabout and the A247 Clandon Road before accessing the new links, hugely adding to local traffic. Even if the direct link to the A3 could be made, some vehicles from Garlick’s Arch traffic would be bound to use the A247 through Send to Woking, going through Burnt Common Roundabout.
The A247 and Burnt Common Roundabout are already gridlocked at busy times; any further traffic would cause significant delays for longer periods, and consequently higher levels of traffic pollution (diesel particulates, carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5283  Respondent: 15504833 / Robert Lynch  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's arch - this Greenbelt site is not needed - any such development of industry site can be at Slyfield.. There is insufficient traffic capacity on the single lane country roads giving access.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5311  Respondent: 15504929 / William Scott  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (88). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy 03).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

Why not?

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11) Some of my friends have struggled to get school places as it is!

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43 Garlick's Arch due to the following points.

There is no proven demand for plots to accommodate Travelling Showpeople.

National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt land. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. It constitutes over development. These further changes to the plan are not required.

It is an unsustainable location. It will undoubtedly cause traffic chaos on the minor surrounding roads. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion, anyone who lives in these areas will confirm that this is the case. Substantially more vehicle movements will result in even more congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

This area contains ancient woodland dating back to the 16th century, which should be preserved. There is no good reason to tamper with it.

This site is identified as being in a Flood Zone 2 and regularly floods during winter months.

This site contains land which is heavily contaminated by many years of shooting with lead shot.

Above all, the latest changes to this site have completely ignored the thousands of previous comments from residents (who know the area best of all) during the 2016 Local Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5336  Respondent: 15505537 / Vincent Carley  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5342  Respondent: 15505601 / Emma Robson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/5425  Respondent: 15506081 / Dale Miller  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5421  Respondent: 15506113 / Sheila Taylor  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5380  Respondent: 15506177 / Jean Calas-Hathaway  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.
coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the fact that the first notification I received of the proposed changes to include development of Garlicks Arch was in early June via a leaflet distributed by a concerned neighbour and not via Guildford Borough Council.

I OBJECT to the fact that GBC have failed to provide sound evidence in terms of the Employment Land Needs Assessment which shows that industrial space at Burnt Common IS NO LONGER NEEDED.

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5414  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4552  Respondent: 15506401 / Alicia Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5401  Respondent: 15506785 / Maverick Hornblow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development at garlic arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5402  Respondent: 15506817 / Reno Hornblow  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to development at garlic arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5435  Respondent: 15506881 / Chloe Brown  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5450  Respondent: 15506913 / Nicholas Mann  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5464  Respondent: 15506945 / Catherine Wyatt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5481  Respondent: 15507105 / N. Hookins  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy (A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2)

The A3 or M25 would have to be improved before any development is done. Highways England has no plans to even start considering improving the A3 before 2020. Clearly no real improvements are possible in the timeframe of this Plan so the developments at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), should not take place.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.

The site is liable to frequent flooding

The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.
I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick's Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5534  Respondent: 15507585 / Patrick Laroche  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5540  Respondent: 15507617 / Ewan Collens  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. There is a danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need for a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is ample spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha) and the Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site as the development would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II) which requires improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object on the grounds of the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and development prior to improvement of these roads will make the situations worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5556  Respondent: 15507713 / Yvonne Connolly  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5557  Respondent: 15507745 / M Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5559  Respondent: 15507809 / M Smith  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5560  Respondent: 15507841 / Mark Fenner  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5565  Respondent: 15508001 / Lisa Barwick  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5566  Respondent: 15508033 / D Worship  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5567  Respondent: 15508065 / Christina Worship  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5590  Respondent: 15508353 / James Hawkey  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to site A43, the proposal for the development of Garlick's Arch.
I object to the late inclusion of site 43.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3469  Respondent: 15509057 / Richard Golding  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A43 changes at Garlick’s Arch because:

This land is GREEN BELT it contains two areas of ancient woodland 50% of the site is subject to flooding and is recognised locally as a FLOOD PLANE (see attached photographs), it carries a flood zone 2 allocation any work carried out to reduce the area flooded would increase the likely hood of flooding in Send Marsh, the Environment Agency undertook work a few years ago in Send Marsh to reduce the risk, but any work on Garlick’s Arch could neutralise the good work done.

If the proposed development of 400 houses and 6 travelling show peoples’ plots were built where will their surface water go, will it just be spirited away, it will certainly not soak into the ground under such a density of buildings.

The proposal for 400 homes totally ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people, and there is no proven demand for travelling show peoples plots in this location.

The ancient woodland on the site has protection under the NPPF section 118 if one locates a development of this size adjacent to woods it can not fail to damage it. I do realise the policy does allow exception for thing of national importance, but this certainly fails to meet that standard. A UK wide state of nature survey undertaken in 2016 shows
worrying trends, so Surrey Wildlife Trust landscape manager Mile Waite undertook a state of nature survey in Surrey and this showed that Surreys flora and fauna appears to be fairing particularly badly with losses far higher than the national level – 12% compared nationally 2%. Of a total of 404 priority species of national conservation concern almost 31% are locally extinct in Surrey while 37% are threatened or in worrying decline leaving 32% considered stable or recovering. The proposed development will not improve the situation it would have a negative effect.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5669</th>
<th>Respondent: 15569505 / David Hawkey</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to site A43, the proposal for the development of Garlick’s Arch. A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the late inclusion of site 43. A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5685</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5687</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570273 / Barnaby Geib</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5689</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570305 / Richard Gray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6970</th>
<th>Respondent: 15570817 / Tom Edelsten</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham
School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4366  **Respondent:** 15570817 / Tom Edelsten  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6968  Respondent: 15571201 / Zoe Dudgeon  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c),
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
  ◦ There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
  ◦ The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed Yet, at the 11th hour, a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site?
  ◦ Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5806  Respondent: 15571617 / Bruce Garbutt  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch

I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

This site had been previously considered and rejected before the previous draft of the Plan. The site was then inserted in the Draft Plan only hours before its publication without any consultation. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. This is a cavalier approach to public engagement by the Council.

1. The site is not a sustainable site, being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

1. The site is susceptible to flooding and development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and near the site. See my comment on Policy P4 above.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

1. The Council appears to view the development as an enabling site to obtain land and developer funding for slip roads on/off the A3. This is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking Green Belt land. The slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential, Government funding...
would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

1. The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement, often at speed. (During the last week of the consultation period of this Plan, a resident of West Clandon had his car written off by a negligent car driver coming the other way and occupying 2/3 of the road at an obvious pinch point which is typically littered with broken wing mirrors.) It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians.

1. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford. There is vague talk in the plan of link roads between Gosden Hill and Garlick’s Arch, all meeting at an enlarged A3 intersection at Burnt Common. The existing intersection is unlit and is accident prone. Adding two or three slip or feeder roads at this point will add to the confusion and public danger.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5721  Respondent: 15571681 / Anne Martin  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5722  Respondent: 15571745 / Hazel Thompson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2) especially when there are suitable sites in brownfield areas that could be developed.

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet two weeks before the start of consultation a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses and the industrial provision, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at such a late stage no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5737</th>
<th>Respondent: 15571937 / S Bennell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement-often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/4702</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15571937 / S Bennell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt.
There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk...
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5733  Respondent: 15572097 / Jackie Wybrow  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq ft of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This is in the greenbelt area and there are definitely brown belt sites in the area that are ripe for development and would keep the green belt in tact. I also understand that the requirement for housing in the Guildford area is not as high as has been specified.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5747  Respondent: 15572641 / Susan Palmer  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5762  Respondent: 15573921 / Carolyne Jackson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

I object to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq ft of industrial space at Garlick's Arch. This is in the greenbelt area and there are definitely brown belt sites in the area that are ripe for development and would keep the green belt in tact. I also understand that the requirement for housing in the Guildford area is not as high as has been specified.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A45 Garlick Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5786</th>
<th>Respondent: 15574337 / Jacqueline Redknap</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5791</th>
<th>Respondent: 15574497 / Ann Murray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to building 400 houses and 7000 sq metres of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5802</th>
<th>Respondent: 15574817 / Martyn Collins</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong></td>
<td>( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see my Objection to Planning Proposal – Policy A 43. 30 ha Land at Garlicks Arch Burnt Common.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like these objections to be seen by the planning Inspector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My objection is based on the following: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is already sufficient housing proposed for the borough (18,860) so there is no need for this additional development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a New site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is Green Belt land permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is a place of natural beauty and a natural conservation area which has existed since the 16th Century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed industrial development is not required (the latest Employment land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% from the previous draft plan. Any industrial space should be located at the already industrialised site at Slyfield.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would cause even more traffic problems to an already daily congested area. The surrounding roads are not suitable or sufficient to take even more traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In short this is an unsuitable development that should not proceed. Whilst I appreciate we need to provide housing and industrial accommodation we must stop using Greenfield sites until we have exhausted all of the Brownfield options that exist in the borough, of which you will be well aware there are many. We must ensure that we manage land in the borough so that we leave future generations areas of natural beauty that they can enjoy and use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attached documents:
Comment ID: pslp172/659  Respondent: 15574817 / Martyn Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to object to Policy A43 (Land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh).

The reasons for my objections are as follows: -

The surrounding Send Marsh area is subject to frequent flooding. A flood plan was put in place a few years ago to try and avoid flooding in the area of Send Marsh Road, between the junctions of Greyfriars Road and Maple Road. The environment agency said at the time that the measures put in place would be suitable for a 1 in 100 years event but this has by no means been as successful as was promised and there is still areas where water lays during prolonged rainfall.

The Environment Agency Plans were based on the surrounding area being a woodland area. Changing the Garlicks Arch area to a housing estate would drastically alter the plans the Environment Agency’s put in place. I attended the open session with the town planners at East Horsley Village Hall and the only comments they could offer was that the site would have to solve its own drainage problems. The fact is there is no where for the water to go other than down the hill to this area of Send Marsh Road. My house has nearly been flooded on a number of occasions. If these plans were to go ahead I would expect a cast iron guarantee from Guildford Council that my house would never be flooded or that they would compensate me in full if it did happen. Are the council willing to give this guarantee? I would like a response on that point please.

I am not against development and building houses. I do not have a problem with building on the Wisley site which I consider to be brownfield due to the amount of concrete that exists for the now unused runway. The land at Garlicks Arch is however permanent Green Belt land, it is woodland and meadowland that needs to be preserved. We should not be building on Green Belt land and use Brownfield sites instead. Again at the open session with the town planners at East Horsley Village Hall I asked why we were not using more Brownfield sites and the reason I was offered was that many Brownfield sites had multiple landlords and it was difficult to get them all to agree to use the land. A problem being difficult is not a reason to destroy woodland that has existed for hundreds of years.

There is already a traffic jam every workday morning, during rush hour, in Send Marsh Road heading up to the junction of Portsmouth Road and again in the evening. The main Portsmouth Road could not cope with the additional traffic that 400 new homes would create and definitely could not cope with large Travellers vehicles. People who do not live in the area would not be aware of the problems the large vehicles cause every year when the Ripley Bonfire takes place to have this type of chaos on a regular basis would be totally unfair on the residents.

There is already sufficient provision for Travellers in Ripley so I do not see why we need to provide more plots.

The Send Marsh area is already densely populated with issues around school places and an over-subscribed Doctor’s surgery. It is already difficult to get a doctor’s appointment this policy is clearly an over development of an area that is already creaking.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5821  Respondent: 15575009 / Tony Redknap  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5813  Respondent: 15575137 / Charlotte Procter  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I OBJECT to the 400 houses and a new interchange with the A3 being put at Burnt Common because Send will have to take a vast increase in traffic if this happens. This traffic would come from the proposed 2000 new houses at Wisley Airfield, 2000 houses at Gosden Hill, Burpham and Blackwell Farm. Much of the traffic from these areas would go to and from the A3, M25, Woking and Guildford through Send. Send is already overloaded with traffic and it would be gridlocked if it had to take on so much more. The pollution levels would also become even worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I Object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) on grounds of congestion

The addition of 400 homes to the Village of Send will result in increased congestion in an already congested area. The impact will be felt in the villages of Send, Clandon and Ripley to name a few.

The only improvements included in the plan to the road network are in the form of two new slip roads which are not expected till “between 2021-27” and at a cost of £10,000,000 each it is possible that they will never be delivered.

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) on grounds of sustainability

The addition of 400 homes to the Village of Send is a disproportionate amount of development in this village and there is a complete lack of provision for infrastructure such as Doctors Surgeries or Schools.

To be clear the local plan has allocated the site for “400 homes and up to 7,000 square metres of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)”. There is NO provision for retail, surgeries or schools. The closest shop referred to as a Waitrose is actually a Little Waitrose in the petrol station.

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) on grounds of deliverability

The deliverability of Garlick’s Arch is highly questionable due to the following:

- Large areas of Garlick’s Arch being in Flood Zones 2 and 3.
- Four electricity pylons running through the centre of the site.
- Ancient Woodland dating back to the 16th Century boarding and within the site.
- Pollution levels currently recorded.
- No existing screening protecting the site from noise or visual impact of the A3.
- Ecological impact.

I object to the inclusion of employment area within Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43)

The creation of a second employment area in Send Village is unnecessary and at the detriment of the village. There is an existing industrial are Burnt Common Nurseries comprising of three industrial units totalling 50,000 square feet. These units are fully occupied and there is sufficient open land to accommodate a further 7,000 square metres.

Combining the two industrial areas will create a strategic employment site for the borough. Whereas locating the new industrial area in close proximity to residential may put of potential tenants concerned about restrictive working hours and will result in increased traffic and road safety issues.

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) and Land for new North facing slip roads to/from A3 (Policy A43a) on the grounds of transparency

The Local Plan is misleading in that it does not state that Policy A43 and Policy A43a are intrinsically connected due to the owners of Garlick’s Arch gifting the land for the slip roads on the condition of receiving planning permission for housing.
Each of these Policies states a number of “Key Considerations” and “Requirements” none of which is that each policy is subject to the adoption of the other.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5828</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575201 / Richard Newman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) and Land for new North facing slip roads to/from A3 (Policy A43a) on the grounds of insufficient information

The last minute inclusion of Garlick’s Arch means that it has not been threw the rigorous scrutiny that all the other sites have. As previously mentioned there are flood risk zones 2 & 3, ancient woodland and known wildlife on the site.

I object to the inclusion of Garlick’s Arch (Policy A43) on the grounds of scale

The allocation of “400 homes and up to 7,000 square metres of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8)” is unsupported. For the larger sites included in the local plan scaled drawings have been produced to show how the development will be accommodated. For Garlick’s Arch there appear to be no such drawings. Of particular interest is how much land will be lost to noise, visual and safety buffers between the A3 (including slip roads) and the rest of the site. Secondly the Flood zones 2 & 3 will need to be accommodated along with woodland and wildlife. How much developable land does this leave?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5848</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575617 / Pete Killingley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This seems a bizarre addition to the local plan, given the local flooding risks, and its sheer scale when compared to the existing size of the village

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/5856</th>
<th>Respondent: 15575713 / Sophie Killingley</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the 400 houses and 7000 square metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This seems a bizarre addition to the local plan, given the local flooding risks, and its sheer scale when compared to the existing size of the village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no infrastructure, it floods and the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5946  Respondent: 15579137 / Nicodemus Brian Rhyner  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5955  Respondent: 15579361 / Caroline May  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/5964  **Respondent:** 15579489 / Ben Palmer  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/5972  Respondent: 15579649 / Peter E May  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

15.  I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6016  **Respondent:** 15581665 / Laura Daboo  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43  

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
CHAOS ON OUR LOCAL ROADS

I OBJECT TO the disproportionate amount of development in one area of the Borough

400 HOUSES AND 7000sq METRES OF INDUSTRIAL SPACE AT GARRICKS LANE

40 HOUSES AND TWO TRAVELLERS PITCHES AT SEND HILL

45 HOUSES AT CLOCKBARN NURSERY

WISLEY SITE 2000 HOMES STILL IN THE LOCAL PLAN

GOSDEN HILL 2,200 HOMES

I OBJECT TO the limited consultation period

VERY SNEAKY LAST MINUTE INCLUSION OF NEW SITES (LESS THAN 2 WEEKS )

I OBJECT TO the lack of Doctors Surgeries to cope with increased residents

HOW WILL THE ROYAL SURREY COPE WITH THOUSANDS MORE PATIENTS

WHERE WILL THEY PARK ?????

THATS IF THEY EVEN ARRIVE IN TIME FOR THEIR APPOINTMENT DUE TO SUCH CONGESTION AROUND THE CATHEDRAL EXIT ON THE A3

I OBJECT TO lack of schools to cope with more residents.

WHERE IS THE SPACE !!!

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6020  Respondent: 15582177 / Caroline Collins  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I would like these objections to be seen by the planning Inspector.

My objection is based on the following: -

There is already sufficient housing proposed for the borough (18,860) so there is no need for this additional development.

This is a New site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

This is Green Belt land permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances here.

The site is a place of natural beauty and a natural conservation area which has existed since the 16th Century.
The proposed industrial development is not required (the latest Employment land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% from the previous draft plan. Any industrial space should be located at the already industrialised site at Slyfield.

A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would cause even more traffic problems to an already daily congested area. The surrounding roads are not suitable or sufficient to take even more traffic.

In short this is an unsuitable development that should not proceed. Whilst I appreciate we need to provide housing and industrial accommodation we must stop using Greenfield sites until we have exhausted all of the Brownfield options that exist in the borough, of which you will be well aware there are many. We must ensure that we manage land in the borough so that we leave future generations areas of natural beauty that they can enjoy and use.

Send Marsh was also known for flooding and to take away more trees and natural sources for the rain water is madness when other options are available.

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch.

I object to site A43a the on and off ramp at Burnt Common / Clandon as this will make the traffic problems currently suffered by Ripley and Send far worse, attracting vehicles from a wide area into trying to access the A3 and M25. When there is an accident or breakdown on the A3 or M25 the villages and surrounding become grid locked, this proposal will cause this to happen even sooner.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6032  Respondent: 15582785 / Charlie Beck  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

As a resident of Send, living in Send Barns Lane, near Burnt Common, I would like to register my objection to the Local Plan that proposes to build many new homes in the area (Garlick's Arch) and in particular proposes to create new north and south bound sliproads to and from the A3 to the A247 at Burnt Common, which will result in a huge amount of permanent congestion in the Burnt Common area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6035  Respondent: 15582817 / Karsten Kollov  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I vehemently object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq meters of industrial space at Garlicks Arch. I have just moved away from the Slyfield industrial estate to an area that I am assured by law cannot be touched for such purposes. We have paid a very hefty premium for the privilege of living in such a place, and will continue to pay the mortgage for many, many years to come. The site floods and is also ancient woodland that needs protection for the generations to come. If industrial space is needed it should be cited with the existing in Slyfield where we have just moved away from. We have been shown no calculations of Guildford housing requirement calculations so there is no basis to plan for the huge number of addition houses being suggested. I also object to the accelerated way these proposals were pushed forward with the hope of the local community not having time to Object.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/246  Respondent: 15582817 / Karsten Kollov  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because;

- I do not see any exceptional circumstances that should force the erosion of green belt land
- It will remove the 'green belt' between Ripley and Send that is necessary for the survival of our native species such as Hedgehogs
- It will generate further traffic that will clog up the area to the detriment of all those currently living here
- A further 400 homes will put futher pressure on local services, which are currently at breaking point; transportation, hospitals, education etc.
- There is no proven requirement for travelling show people plots
- It will spoil the current beauty and openness of the area, which is what attracted my family and I in the first place.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6063  **Respondent:** 15583169 / Poul Jensen  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6072  Respondent: 15583553 / Malcolm Murray  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to proposals to build on land known as "Garlick's Arch"

Proposal A 43.

There are no justifiable reasons for ripping out an area of ancient woodland and is an example of why the green belt has to be maintained almost at any cost.

Part of the site is below the road level of the A3 and would require an enormous amount of earthworks similar to that at Burpham to provide sound absorption and diffusion.

There is no particular need for industrial space to be on our doorstep, as we have moved on from the 18th century and do not need a workplace just round the corner from where we live. There is a perfectly good industrial park at Slyfield Green, but a few minutes away, and with the ability to expand onto relatively poor land if there was such a demand.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/2962</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15583553 / Malcolm Murray</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because the proposal is still completely irresponsible in it's destruction of historic woodland without bothering to find some justification or exceptional circumstances to warrant this course of action.

The proposed area for the development is alongside of the A3 and is either level with or below the road level, which will require enormous sound barriers to be built to make the homes habitable.

One of the purposes of the Green Belt was to stop uncontrolled ribbon development along highways between individual towns and villages and this proposal will remove at a stroke the majority of the separation between Send and Ripley.

The Local Plan H1 Policy states that 'where there is an identified need sites for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople should be provided on developments of 500 homes or more, yet this requirement seems to be thrown out of the window when it comes to developments in Send. Is it related to the fact we have elected 'Independent' councillors.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>PSLPS16/6001</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15583585 / Josephine Rooke</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Sound?</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>is Legally Compliant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6082  Respondent: 15583585 / Josephine Rooke  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6081  Respondent: 15583617 / Deborah Gillam  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6088  Respondent: 15583809 / Nigel Stephenson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. ** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

   Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government clearly state that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.
The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
• There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
• The site is liable to frequent flooding
• It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
• There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6096  Respondent: 15584065 / Amy Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This field floods regularly so is not suitable for purpose. Also, there is no need for this huge industrial space to be built on this site when there’s a brownfield site up the road in Slyfield that can take any of this sort of development. It will just ruin this land and bring in loads of traffic and pollution.

I OBJECT to the fact that Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill are in green belt land and therefore should not be used for building whatever because safeguarding the green belt stops developers from creating urban sprawls and this is what we will get if these sites are developed. Nowhere will be safe from development if the council keeps changing the boundaries of the green belt to suit their purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6099  Respondent: 15584065 / Amy Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the building of 400 houses and 7000 sq m of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. This field floods regularly so is not suitable for purpose. Also, there is no need for this huge industrial space to be built on this site when there’s a brownfield site up the road in Slyfield that can take any of this sort of development. It will just ruin this land and bring in loads of traffic and pollution.

I OBJECT to the fact that Garlick’s Arch and Gosden Hill are in green belt land and therefore should not be used for building whatever because safeguarding the green belt stops developers from creating urban sprawls and this is what we will get if these sites are developed. Nowhere will be safe from development if the council keeps changing the boundaries of the green belt to suit their purposes.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6104  Respondent: 15584097 / George Gervasio  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the environmental damage that will occur to the Ancient Woodland at Garlick’s Arch if the development goes ahead, particularly if the industrial site is allowed. These trees protect against pollution and should not be threatened. Generally the poor air quality resulting from all the extra, congested traffic will damage village life generally.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6115</th>
<th>Respondent: 15584481 / Jeremy Hamilton</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6123  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7045  Respondent: 15584641 / Miriam Gilkerson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- As a resident within very close proximity to Garlicks Arch (we live in Burnt Common Close) I object to the late inclusion of the proposed development (site A43 Garlicks Arch)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6145  Respondent: 15584961 / Helen Meredith  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch
I object to Policy A43 and A43a in relation to plans for Garlick’s Arch. This site was only inserted into the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft. The site is not a sustainable site being far from infrastructure facilities and transport links. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt. There is no evidence in the plan of the exceptional circumstances required to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland by which the site is bordered - a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement - often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infant school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

The stated preference in the Plan is to make best use of previously developed land. Nonetheless a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

I object to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition of north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic as the route from London/M25 to Woking would be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 would go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3664  Respondent: 15585281 / Val Woodland  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because

* it is on permanent Green Belt land,
* there are no exceptional circumstances,
* it would join Send and Ripley, which defeats the purpose of Green Belt,
* it is on ancient woodland

I also object to Policy A58 at Burnt Common because

* it is in the middle of Green Belt
* Slyfield and Guildford industrial areas still have empty units
* the 2017 Employment Land Need Assessment shows a reduction in demand for industrial land
* there will be a severe impact on local traffic

There is no need for large quantities of new, expensive housing in Send for wealthy people who will then perpetuate the 'not in my backyard' approach to further new housing.

I do, however, think there is a major need for affordable housing in Send, but I see no need for it to be on Green Belt or ancient woodland.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6159  Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – The late inclusion of Garlicks Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7096</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO – the late inclusion of Garlicks Arch Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4039</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585313 / Kim Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6167</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT TO – A43 GARLICKS ARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4019</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585345 / Wanita Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

2. I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

5. I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6174  **Respondent:** 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT TO – the late inclusion of Garlicks Arch Site A43. The Plan should develop the existing brownfield site at Burnt Common rather than developing Garlick’s Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3448  **Respondent:** 15585409 / Vanessa Styles  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3451</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3452</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585409 / Vanessa Styles</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6180</th>
<th>Respondent: 15585441 / Laurie Will</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6195  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: pslp172/2185  Respondent: 15585793 / Mark Horigan  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6217  Respondent: 15585921 / Michael Hickey  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the above plan for the following reasons:

I object to the use of Green Belt land which should be protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlement.

I object to this plan because there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant destruction of Green Belt land that is covered by ancient woodland and is a particularly sensitive conservation area.

I object to the use of protected Green Belt land for industrial development since land will be available at Slyfield Industrial Park should it be needed, which according to the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015, it is not (80% reduction in employment floor space.

I object to the erosion of quality of life though inadequate infrastructure to support this development. The proposed takes no account of GBC's Transport Assessment which highlights infrastructure overload. Improving access in a limited part of the system (Burnt Common) simply gridlocks adjacent areas such as Send and Ripley.

I object to the lack of social infrastructure to support this plan. Health, Education and Transport provision in this area is already inadequate within the hinterland of the proposed development.

I object that this site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to the development of some 400 houses plus 7000sq m of industrial and warehousing building on the Garlicks Arch’.

The Portsmouth Road is often used as a substitute for the A3 in terms of speed and bad driving, which would multiply with the level of additional traffic which must be anticipated with the proposed development on this site. I live in nearby Send Marsh and often see instances of drivers taking high risks in pulling out of Send Marsh Road into the Portsmouth Road. Again the potential for quite serious traffic collisions would be increased from the level of the increase in traffic flow along the Portsmouth Road. This particular junction is badly in need of traffic safety measures as it stands, the increase of significantly more traffic would increase the potential for collisions to an unacceptable point. The consequences of an accompanying increase of heavy goods vehicles associated with the proposed industrial site are self-evident.

The thought of a major increase in traffic flow facing local people needs to be seriously considered before any approval is given to the local plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

I object to the employment strategy and impact at Garlick’s Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

There is no need for new industrial sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43). There is an existing brownfield industrial site at Burnt Common that could easily accommodate the 7,000 sq m proposed. That site was removed from the Plan without any reasoning.

Furthermore the development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been for there decades employing local people and are therefore clearly sustainable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6266</th>
<th>Respondent: 15587361 / Aileen Creegan</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is for making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I would like to register an objection to the above named local plan and the above section for the following reasons:

1. Impact of traffic on Send village and neighbouring villages as a result of an additional 400 homes being built. Improvements to road network in the form of two new slip roads is not expected till between 2021-33 and at a cost of £10m each it is highly likely they will never be delivered.
2. The addition of 400 homes to the small village of Send is a disproportionate amount of development and there is a complete lack of provision for Doctors Surgeries or Schools.
3. The creation of a second employment area in Send when there are existing industrial units at Burnt Common Nurseries and space to expand to satisfy the demand. The proposed mixed development will cause issues such as road safety due to mixing commercial and private vehicles in the development. Secondly the proximity of the industrial units to the residential may put of potential tenants concerned about restrictive working hours.
4. The Garlick’s Arch site is in the Green Belt and used for agricultural purpose. Any development will result in the loss of rural employment.
5. The Local Plan is misleading in that it does not explain that Policies A43 and A43a are intrinsically connected due to the owners of Garlick’s Arch gifting the land for the slip roads on condition of receiving planning permission for housing.
6. The deliverability of Garlick’s Arch in 0-5 years is highly questionable due to the following – Garlick’s Arch being in Flood Zone 3, Four electricity pylons running through the centre of the site, Ancient Woodland dating back to the 16th Century, Pollution levels currently recorded, No existing screening protecting the site from noise or visual impact of the A3.
7. The Garlick’s Arch site replaced the Burnt Common Nurseries Site which was included in all previous drafts of the local plan and was allocated for industrial use and housing. Whereas the Garlick’s Arch site is Green Belt and has never been previously developed the Burnt Common Nurseries site has been previously developed and includes three industrial units totalling 50,000 square feet. This site was previously highlighted as key to meeting the industrial needs of the Borough.
8. The last minute inclusion of Garlick’s Arch means that it has not been threw the rigorous scrutiny that all the other sites have.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/6286  Respondent: 15587905 / Clare Claxton  Agent:**

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID: PSLPS16/6292  Respondent: 15588001 / Mary Jane Godfrey  Agent:**

---

**Section page number**  Page 1280 of 1552  **Document page number** 1829
**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5)

The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

Attached documents:

---

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

The proposed population growth at site A43 in particular (48% - 3.2% per annum over the plan period), where 400 new homes are being proposed, is an unsustainable and entirely ill-conceived one. The Office of National Statistics projects a growth of 0.57% across the whole UK for the same period, therefore I am curious as to how the architects of the GBC Local Plan consider this to be a sensible one. I also refer you to the lack of due process in your own planning procedures, whereby a last-minute change was made in April/May 2016 to the GBC Local Plan to add the Garlick's Arch development. From October 2013-May 2016 there had been no reference made to a development at Garlick's Arch. Instead there had been regular consultation on Burnt Common Warehouse. This latter development was inexplicably deleted from the proposals in May 2016 and replaced with a previously unmentioned development at Garlick's Arch, adding a further 300 homes to the Local Plan. Such an act is exceptionally bad practice (I concur entirely with Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design in this regard); please could the Council explain why it considers making this last-minute decision, after almost three years of consultation, an example of acceptable policy-making? **I therefore restate my objection to policy A43; it should be removed.**

*What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?*

Attached documents:

---

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6337  **Respondent:** 15588897 / John Attridge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. As mentioned, there are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government states clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance. The Plan states the preference is to use previously developed land, but Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common and replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6346  **Respondent:** 15588929 / Alex Hutchings  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**POLICY A43 AND A43a – Garlick’s Arch**

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.
I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6365  Respondent: 15589665 / Anna Worsley  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6369</th>
<th>Respondent: 15589889 / Keith Macdonald</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to make the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no railway station within reasonable walking distance, it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6392</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590241 / Claire Tallis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6404</th>
<th>Respondent: 15590273 / Eunja Madge</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly, any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6411  **Respondent:** 15590529 / Linda Mumford  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick’s Arch, opposite Send Marsh Road, (400 houses and 7,000 sq. Metres of industrial space) slipped in at the last moment in the hope it would be overlooked. This particular site reeks of underhandedness and it would be interesting to know who has a vested interest in this going ahead. Such a large number of houses and industrial buildings on virgin green fields is criminal in the extreme. Guildford has plenty of existing industrial complexes that would welcome expansion and which already have the infrastructure in place to take the traffic generated. Such a large number of houses and influx of people will totally change the character of the area. Where are the extra schools and doctors to support these numbers? We are struggling now to get appointments with our doctors and our children into our schools of choice right now, increase the population by 25% and it will be impossible

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6429  **Respondent:** 15590593 / Johnathan Page  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6433  Respondent: 15590849 / Nigel Freebody  Agent:

Document:   Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the 2016 draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 400 homes at the Garlic Arch site on the Ripley/Send borders on the grounds that this proposal would include the destruction of ancient establish broad leave woodland and the large scale destruction of agricultural land. Both of these areas are an important part of the local green belt.
I object strongly to the 2016 draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 400 homes at the Garlic Arch site on the Ripley/Send borders on the grounds that both these areas are strategic for the natural absorption of local rainwater runoff. Even with these natural areas, the Environment Agency deemed it a necessity to spend considerable sums in 2006-2007 to protect Sendmarsh and Maple Roads from repeat flooding from Garlic Arch runoff. Calculations for these defences would NOT have taken into account the additional problems that would inevitable result from building over this natural ground absorption. If the proposal were to go ahead, Sendmarsh residents would be at a substantially greater risk of flooding and be severely disadvantaged by increased insurance premiums and devaluation of property.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6434  Respondent: 15590849 / Nigel Freebody  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 draft Local Plan for the proposed development of 400 homes at the Garlic Arch site on the grounds that key local community services, including but not limited to GP surgeries/dental practices/schooling, are already overstretched. Such services do not have the capacity to sustain any substantial increase in local population as would inevitable result from the proposed additional housing.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6435  Respondent: 15590849 / Nigel Freebody  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the 2016 draft Local Plan for the proposed development of new industrial sites (under policy E2 and E5) in the Garlic Arch area. Existing brown field sites within the borough are already far better suited to new industrial developments without the need to destroy additional agricultural land.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2552  Respondent: 15590849 / Nigel Freebody  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object strongly to the 2017 revised draft Local Plan for the proposed development of housing at Garlic Arch (site A43) on the Ripley/Send borders. The removal of the previous limit of 400 new homes leaves the site entirely open ended for additional destruction of Green Belt land. This is both ambiguous and unacceptable.
I object to the 2017 revised draft Local Plan for the expansion of previously proposed new industrial sites at Garlic Arch (site A43). Existing brown field sites within the borough are already far better suited to these industrial developments without the need to destroy additional Green Belt land.

I object to the 2017 revised draft Plan for inclusion under the development of Garlic Arch (site A43) of travelling showpeople plots with storage facilities. There is no justification for such inclusion within the Green Belt area and sacrifice of Green Belt land for this purpose seems inappropriate and cavalier.

I object to the 2017 revised draft Plan proposals for the number of showpeople plots at the Garlic Arch (site A43). The proposed allocation is disproportionate to the number of possible homes on the site as compared with other local development plans, such as the Wisley aerodrome site.

I strongly object to the maintained inclusion of the woodland area at Garlic Arch (site A43). There is absolutely no justification for the wholesale destruction of this well-established ancient woodland. At the very least, this woodland area should be removed entirely from any proposals for development of the remainder of the site.

I object strongly to the 2017 revised draft Local Plan for the proposed development of increased number of homes at the Garlic Arch (site A43) because, as outlined in previous objections, both these areas are strategic for the natural absorption of local rainwater runoff. Additional homes over and above the previously stated limit of 400 homes will only further exacerbate the water runoff problems and further increase the flood risk.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) than the Burnt Common site did]”

b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

14. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

The most distressing element of this plan is that such a large proportion of the overall proposed development is being targeted on this small part of the borough. It is simply disproportionate and there is little understanding being shown by those elected to represent our views. I trust, therefore, that these objections will be given your full attention and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3123</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593665 / Thomas Cope</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no &quot;exceptional circumstances&quot; exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6518</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593729 / Martin Warwick</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6517</th>
<th>Respondent: 15593761 / Celestyn Kwapisiewicz</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object</strong> to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6560  **Respondent:** 15594817 / Toni Thompson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6526  Respondent: 15594849 / Andrew Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

• I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6532  Respondent: 15594945 / Sally Thomas  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6536  Respondent: 15595105 / James Beauchamp  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6551</th>
<th>Respondent: 15595297 / Caroline Davison</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to building 400 houses and 7000m2 of industrial space at Garlick's Arch.</strong> Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2110</th>
<th>Respondent: 15595553 / Carol Davis</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch as this is Green Belt land with areas of ancient woodland that should not be designated for Travelling Showpeople. There are no exceptional circumstances for building on this land.</strong> I note that an application in Vicarage Lane for one house was recently turned down as it is in the Green Belt and yet this is proposing over 400 houses and sites for travellers on Green Belt land incorporating ancient woodland. This does not make sense. Other factors that must be considered include:-</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment ID: PSLPS16/6576  Respondent: 15595585 / Tim Wiggins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Infrastructure Plan as it takes no account of the proposed development in Garlick's Arch - proper consultation and inclusion of this development has obviously not happened, so the plan is flawed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6577  Respondent: 15595585 / Tim Wiggins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I further object to the development at Garlick's Arch due to the inadequate assessment of flooding risk - as evidenced by the Environment Agencies assessment being higher than GBC's. Every winter the drainage from Burnt Common Lane onto Portsmouth road floods, despite previous attempts to improve the situation. Our house has also been flooded previously, causing pain and increased insurance premiums, so the low risk assessment has obviously not included previous incidents in the area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6586  Respondent: 15595681 / Willemien Downes  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6591  **Respondent:** 15596129 / Kim Beauchamp  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

I object to building 400 houses and 7000m² of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6638  **Respondent:** 15598241 / Madeleine Hewish  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000m² of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.

The site is liable to frequent flooding

The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.

There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

---
Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

I Object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is protected from development due to it's Green Belt status. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow it's removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2) - Central Government clearly state that the need for new housing is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan clearly states the preference is to use previously developed land, but Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common, and replaced this with Garlick's Arch.

The Garlick's Arch is not appropriate because:

- there is no sustainable transport infrastructure
- the site is liable to frequent flooding
- it contains ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat - yet there is no wildlife report for the site in the Plan
- there are no plans to increase local school places or local medical services, or any plans to improve local utilities in order to meet the additional demand from these new houses.
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this...
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  

| Comment ID: | PSLPS16/6694 | Respondent: | 15601121 / Elspeth Anderson | Agent: |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Document:   | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 |
| Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ) , is Sound? ( ) , is Legally Compliant? ( ) |

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site...
will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c),
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the
removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly
acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from
the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a
Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all,
so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services
in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to
offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There
are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).
This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders
(Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the
woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The
development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The
Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services
such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any
residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a
shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars
for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will
cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this
important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.
It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which
forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. There was no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement—often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this
site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6727  **Respondent:** 15601825 / Claire Billard  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garlick’s Arch (policy A43) This was a very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process so should be removed. The proposal to build circa 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. light industrial/storage, warehousing Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for wildlife, and a clear separation for the A3 and the village. It was also never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council’s ‘Issues and Options report’ or identified for development in the 2014 consultation. In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from ‘Oldlands’to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so the council should not now consider the
construction of 400 houses and 7,000 sq. metres of employment space there? There is insufficient infrastructure to support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just petrol station with a small shop, one local doctors’ surgery that is full, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity especially the Clandon Road. Any development in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be detrimental of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add a 41% (960) increase to the existing population of 2,341. The proposed would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6724</th>
<th>Respondent: 15601857 / Martin Billard</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Garlick’s Arch (policy A43)**

This was a very late and very major change to the Local Plan proposals does appear to have not followed the correct due process so should be removed.

The proposal to build circa 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. light industrial/storage, warehousing Green Belt land, lying outside the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village boundary, defies all logic. This area which includes ancient woodland is a refuge for wildlife. and a clear separation for the A3 and the village. It was also never considered as a Potential Development Area within the Council’s ‘Issues and Options report’ or identified for development in the 2014 consultation.

In 2014 the Council rejected a planning application from ‘Oldlands’ to build 25 houses in this location on sound planning grounds, so the council should not now consider the construction of 400 houses and 7,000sq.m. of employment space there?

There is insufficient infrastructure to support such a development. Send Marsh/Burnt Common has one just petrol station with a small shop, one local doctors’ surgery that is full, no schools and the local roads are already filled to capacity especially the Clandon Road.

Any development in this area would be totally inappropriate and would be detrimental of Send Marsh/Burnt Common as a village. The housing proposal alone would add a 41% (960) increase to the existing population of 2,341.

The proposed would significantly detract from the open countryside aspect and add dramatically to the existing road use.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6736</th>
<th>Respondent: 15602113 / Janet Woodward</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I OBJECT TO the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch.
### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7250  Respondent: 15602529 / Darren Lambert  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

2. I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

10. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/6767  Respondent: 15602817 / Paul Douek  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: PSLPS16/7414  Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I object to development in areas at risk of flooding (Policy P4). The Environment Agency classifies the site at Garlicks Arch (A43) as being in a higher risk than the Council's own assessment. The plan does not take adequate account of the
flood risk as required by National Planning Policy, especially as this area has flooded many times in recent years. Flooding has been a particular concern in 2013 and 2015, with considerable damage to properties in the areas. I do not want this exacerbated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7416   Respondent: 15603297 / Rony Douek   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) in the plans. Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

- I object to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3). Damage will be caused to the ancient woodland of oak trees at Garlicks Arch site (A43) proposal, and the loss of green space and amenity

- I object to the proposed Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix C). There is no schedule for Garlicks Arch (A43); the plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and therefore it is not fit for purpose

- I object to the employment strategy and impact on Garlicks Arch (A43) (Policies E2 and E5). The development will result in the loss of existing local successful businesses, which have been employing local people over many decades, and are therefore sustainable.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7266   Respondent: 15603361 / Ann Watkins   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to A43 Garlick’s Arch – the site floods and is covered in ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed and if necessary could be accommodated at Slyfield. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt site is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6786   Respondent: 15603489 / Simon Pitt   Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.) The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians. The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford. Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2). The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016. Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site. National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3). The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4). This site is bordered by Ancient woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4) It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1) Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a) The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic. The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved. This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.
National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

** I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick's Arch is protected from development due to its Green Belt status. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow its removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2) - Central Government clearly state that the need for new housing is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan clearly states the preference is to use previously developed land, but Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common, and replaced this with Garlick's Arch.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6838  Respondent: 15607553 / Penelope Gillmore  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current "soft" edge approach to Guildford.
Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory
purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6858  **Respondent:** 15608545 / Madeleine Ringshaw  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

---

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is for making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced by a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light to local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)
It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, and these will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/6864  **Respondent:** 15608801 / Beth Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4465  **Respondent:** 15608801 / Beth Fuller  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6870  Respondent: 15609057 / Julian Long  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 - 30ha land at Garlick’s Arch, Burnt Common designated for 400 houses and 7,000m2 of industrial and warehousing. There is no need for any more houses on top of the 13,860 already proposed for the Borough. This site is new and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted on previously. It is Green Belt permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents further merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances. The site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered with ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th Century would be gravely endangered. The proposed industrial development of 7,000m2 is simply not required since the last ELNA in 2015 shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000m2 of industrial space it should be at Slyfield. A new four-way interchange onto the A3 at Burnt Common would be disastrous for Send. The traffic in Send Road (A247) would be gridlocked all day. Send would become the through route to Woking for traffic leaving the M25 and A3, the proposed 2,000 houses at Wisley and the 2,000 houses at Burpham. The village of Send simply could not take this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6873  Respondent: 15609153 / Alex Laxton  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Please accept this as an OBJECTION to policies A43 and A43a of the Proposed Submission Guildford Local Plan.

I will elaborate on the detail of the objections below, but I wish to state that I was extremely disappointed by the sudden and inexplicable removal of the Burnt Common Nursery site to the southeast of the Garlick’s Arch site; especially since this site had been included in previous drafts of the Local Plan and I understand that Guildford Borough Council had also highlighted it as key to meeting the industrial needs of the Borough:

1. Burnt Common Nurseries has previously been developed and as such constitutes ‘brown field’ development with no loss of valuable agricultural land.
2. The site is effectively screened from the A3, the B2215 (London Road) and from the A247 (Clandon Road). These three roads also form definitive boundaries to the site to prevent further ‘development creep’.
3. The site already includes c.50,000 ft² of industrial units. The landowner/potential developer has produced a scheme to bring further employment to the area through a sympathetic, landscaped industrial development. This is readily deliverable.
4. The same landowner has proposed a scheme of c.100 houses adjacent to the village but screened from existing properties. The access is good, the scheme is readily deliverable, the scale of the development is sustainable for the local village and, to the best of my knowledge, the local population are broadly supportive of this proposal. Instead of including this readily deliverable mixed employment/residential scheme, Policy A43 is proposed instead:

1. With no apparent consultation, the village of Send Marsh is now confronted by a scheme to add c.400 houses and 75,000 ft² of industrial space on green belt land with no overriding justification.
2. The 30 ha site is not screened in any way from the A3 (which would cause significant traffic noise and disruption to future inhabitants), the B2215 Portsmouth Road or from the houses in Burnt Common Lane.
3. The site currently constitutes agricultural land (and not a paddock as suggested), plus woodland which is believed to date to the C.16th. No justification has been provided for the development of this area or for the loss of important habitats and mature trees; but these significant issues do call into question the overall deliverability of the scheme.
4. The site is in Flood Zone 3. No detail has been provided as to how this is to be addressed in order to permit development; but this, again, suggests that the site is not readily deliverable.
5. Regarding residential development and the risk of electro-magnetic radiation, the site is traversed by high voltage power lines and pylons forming part of the National Grid.
6. 400 houses are likely to add over 1,000 people to the local community. There is no mention of how this many families will be accommodated by the existing schools, shops, doctors, dentists and other infrastructure. Furthermore, public transport is limited, so it can safely be assumed that the majority of these houses will have one or two cars each with associated parking and congestion issues; especially at peak times.
7. It is not clear how 400 houses can be situated on this site, plus the development of some 75,000 ft² industrial space; how the two can be separated and how safe access for both users can be provided.
8. There is no mention within the Draft Local Plan that Policies A43 and A43a are apparently connected due to the owners of Garlick’s Arch gifting the land for the slip roads on condition of receiving planning permission for housing. This, in itself, calls into question the motivation for inexplicably dropping the Burnt Common Nursery site and including a significantly less deliverable and sustainable alternative.
9. Due to the costs of the construction for the on/off slip roads detailed in Policy A43a, it is questionable whether they will ever be constructed. In the event of the Borough Council/Highways Agency having both the funds and the motivation to build the slip roads in the future, the land could be acquired at that time by commercial agreement or CPO as required. There is no need for the Borough Council to involve itself in a dubious linked-transaction that could give rise to questions about collusion.

To conclude, a mixed use redevelopment at the site of the former Burnt Common Nurseries is supported. Policy A43 and its conjoined policy A43a is opposed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to building 400 houses and 7000m² of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Ancient woodland! Subject to flooding! Plenty of brownfield sites already available in the borough! Slyfield is already the industrial centre of Guildford Borough so why create another one especially as there is an over supply of industrial space in the area at the moment and for the foreseeable future. In addition, Guildford’s housing plan requirements have been shown to be grossly exaggerated and when challenged, the council refuses to release their calculations.
I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43).

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but Guildford Borough Council have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6932  Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c),
general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/6938</th>
<th>Respondent: 15610785 / Liz Vinall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, potentially capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
There is no need for the new employment floorspace to be located at Garlick’s Arch in the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I OBJECT to the loss of rural employment (Policy E5)

Policy E5 supports the retention and development of local services and community facilities in our inset and identified villages. Yet the development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises. The Plan does not promote rural employment; rather it will result in the loss of existing local rural businesses.

I OBJECT to the damage to the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3)

I OBJECT to the local plan based on the impact it will have on the special countryside of the borough.

The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch (A43) would have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, potentially capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.
Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6947  Respondent: 15611105 / Ramsey Shubbar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6948  Respondent: 15611137 / Scott Hutchinson  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)
Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6949  Respondent: 15611201 / Jed Alexander  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/6953  Respondent: 15611457 / sam collins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

There is already sufficient housing proposed for the borough (18,860) so there is no need for this additional development.

This is a New site and was not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has not been consulted upon previously.

This is Green Belt land permanently protected by the NPPF which prevents the merging of settlements. There are no exceptional circumstances here.

The site is a place of natural beauty and a natural conservation area which has existed since the 16th Century.

The proposed industrial development is not required (the latest Employment land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% from the previous draft plan. Any industrial space should be located at the already industrialised site at Slyfield.

A new 4 way interchange onto the A3 would cause even more traffic problems to an already daily congested area. The surrounding roads are not suitable or sufficient to take even more traffic.

In short this is an unsuitable development that should not proceed. Whilst I appreciate we need to provide housing and industrial accommodation we must stop using Greenfield sites until we have exhausted all of the Brownfield options that exist in the borough, of which you will be well aware there are many.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of
Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:
The site cannot possibly be considered as sustainable in any real sense, being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3). The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.
The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the
east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause
immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7021  **Respondent:** 15616929 / Nigel Wickham  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure; it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7031  **Respondent:** 15617185 / Michelle Mitchell  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

**I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)**

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure; it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7037  **Respondent:** 15618305 / Lawrence Claridge  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally
Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a
shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and
transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)

The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7038  Respondent: 15618337 / Matthew Pitt  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for
turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7042  Respondent: 15618689 / Julia Ray  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Garlick's Arch is Greenbelt. I want to protect our greenbelt for our future generations. It is precious and it is loved by our communities. It creates a better environment for us and a happier, healthier place to live. We cannot live happy lives with endless sprawl. We need access to green spaces and this is a protected site. It has not purpose being suggested for housing, which should be built on brownfield sites only and in urban areas. Our natural environment cannot be replaced and should not ever be considered appropriate to develop.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7059  Respondent: 15619073 / Paul Collins  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. Crownhall Estates (CE) has long standing land promotion agreements in place with the owners of land falling within the overall allocation (edged blue) as shown hatched red on the plan.
2. These land promotion agreements predate the identification of this allocation in the current Draft Local Plan and the promotion of the larger allocation by Ptarmigan Land (PL) on behalf of the owners of that land.
3. Sites A and B are previously developed land which could accommodate circa 35 dwellings accessed from Portsmouth Road and Burnt Common Lane respectively.
4. Sites A and B are deliverable housing sites in their own right (as defined by Footnote 11 to Framework Paragraph 47 in that they are available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and are achievable with a realistic prospect that viable housing could be delivered on the site within five years) and both could assist the Council to identify and maintain a 5 year supply as part of the identified annual housing requirements for the district from the base date of 2018 without reliance upon or prejudice to the delivery of the larger allocation or the intended access to same from the A3 (Site Allocation A43a) later in the plan period.
5. However, CE is willing to work with PL and Guildford Borough Council (GBC) to enable the comprehensive development of the wider site as envisaged in the allocation and to ensure that development on each land parcel is complementary to the other and planned in manner that forms an effective and efficient holistic development
of the overall allocation for its intended purpose but considers that in the circumstances here the wording of Draft Policy 43 will need to be amended (possibly by adding more detail as to how it is envisaged that the overall package will be delivered particularly with regard to component elements and phasing) so as to allow these two deliverable sites to be released so that they can assist the Council to maintain a 5 year supply whilst the remaining and larger developable part of the site (for years 6 – 10) is put in place with the corresponding level of infrastructure.

6. CE looks forward to working with PL and GBC so as to deliver this allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  A9Ra224nq_o2grrn_1a8.jpg (72 KB)
                       A9Reyurgi_o2grrx_1a8.jpg (56 KB)

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7071  Respondent: 15624257 / Saleem Farooqui  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )

I am writing to oppose the development of land near Ripley.

The proposed site for housing is in the Local Plan as "Garlick's Arch".

Although GBC have been consulting with the public on the draft local plan since 2014 the Garlick's Arch development was only included in the plan just two weeks before it went to the full Council for approval at the end of June.

This area is beautiful and large scale development would desecrate the wonderful countryside here. Furthermore, my local clay pigeon shooting club (Cobham Sporting Gun) operates on this land and is a wonderful example of the kind of british country pursuit that this land development would quash.

Ripley and the surrounding land has an old world charm of an idyllic british village. Wholesale development would forever change the area awfully.

I implore you to reconsider developing here.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7072  Respondent: 15624481 / Robin Clarke  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )

I object to the proposed change from Protected Open Space to C3 housing for the following reasons:

1. The town would lose a valuable open space which complements the Cathedral and makes it the landmark that it is. Moreover lights from the proposed houses would reduce the impact of the Cathedral at night.
2. The site has a long history of problems of drainage and subsidence, and a housing development there would exacerbate these problems, adversely affecting properties lower down the hill.
3. There are already major traffic problems affecting local roads, and the additional cars from the 100 extra houses in the area would make the current situation considerably worse.

I do hope that when the local plan is considered for these reasons this change in use will be rejected.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7092  **Respondent:** 15627009 / Alison Morrison  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I particularly object to the proposed destruction of ancient woodland at Garlick’s Arch.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7103  **Respondent:** 15627329 / Loraine Crates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7134  **Respondent:** 15629025 / Surrey County Council (Sir or madam)  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43

**Land at Garlick’s Arch Page 221**

Policy A43: Under the column headed “Requirements,” please add the following bullet points:

- “Main vehicular access via a new roundabout on A247 frontage, to also provide fourth arm for proposed A3 on slip.”
- “Permeability/ connectivity for pedestrians/ cyclists to B2215 Portsmouth Road.”
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7152  Respondent: 15629377 / The Woodland Trust (Jack Taylor)  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference number</th>
<th>Name of site</th>
<th>Nearest town</th>
<th>Development description</th>
<th>Woodland adjacent or within?</th>
<th>Type of woodland affected (e.g. ASNW, PAWS, secondary) &amp; grid reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Land at Garlic’s Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt common and Ripley</td>
<td>Send</td>
<td>Mixed use-C3, B1c, B2, B8</td>
<td>Within</td>
<td>Garlic’s Arch ASNW, TQ042551 Unnamed ASNW, TQ045552 Oldland’s Copse, TQ045550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7253  Respondent: 15633217 / Emma Cooper  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the plans for Garlicks Arch. Our infrastructure is already struggling with the current occupancy in the area. Our roads are regularly gridlocked, particularly Send Road and Send Marsh Road with the flow of traffic onto the A3, which would only increase with an extra 400 houses and services to the proposed industrial units. Services such as the local schools and doctors are already at full capacity, with it being increasingly difficult to get a doctors appointment even for young children. This issue would only amplify with the proposed developments. Our roads and pavements are already in a state of disrepair and an increase of pedestrians and vehicles will only make this matter worse.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7234  Respondent: 15634145 / Annette Davies  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the late inclusion of the A43 Garlicks Arch development as resident of Burnt Common Lane this will have a substantial effect on myself and my family. This development will obviously completely change this small and sleep hamlet of Send and Ripley. One of my main concerns is with regard to flooding. It is also a site with a large amount of ancient woodlands. The industrial development is certainly not needed, and with regarding to the housing it my belief that the housing need for the area has been grossly exaggerated.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to any and all erosion of the green belt, there is precious little left in this area of the county. In setting local villages will destroy the area (Policy P2).

The area surrounding Burnt Common is now subject to a disproportionate level of suggested housing and development (Policy A43).

This was not included in the Regulation 18 Draft and therefore has not been consulted on previously, it seems a cynical method of circumventing the correct process. I object.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7302  Respondent: 15639905 / Alison Azzopardi  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The area surrounding Garlick’s Arch contains ancient woodland, protected by its position within the current green belt. Any relaxation of the planning rules to allow development in this area will open the door to further development. I object to this in the strongest terms.
- The proposed development of 400 homes directly on the large field adjacent to the A3 with an additional (and unnecessary 7000 sq m industrial area) will destroy a local business and the ‘Cobham Sporting Gun’ shooting club which has been in existence for the last 25 years. I feel extraordinarily aggrieved that a site, covered in woodland will be removed and sold for in excess of 20 times its current value (on the basis of grant planning approval for housing). I object to this strongly.
- Existing infrastructure, already under pressure will in no way benefit from increased residential accommodation in the area. There appears to be no provision for more schools or doctors surgeries to offset this increase in population. I object to this on the basis it is unsuitable in the extreme.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7325  Respondent: 15640705 / M J Azzopardi  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- The area surrounding Garlick’s Arch contains ancient woodland, protected by its position within the current green belt. Any relaxation of the planning rules to allow development in this area will open the door to further development. I object to this in the strongest terms.
- The proposed development of 400 homes directly on the large field adjacent to the A3 with an additional (and unnecessary 7000 sq m industrial area) will destroy a local business and the ‘Cobham Sporting Gun’ shooting club which has been in existence for the last 25 years. As a member of this club, I feel extraordinarily aggrieved that a site, covered in woodland will be removed and sold for in excess of 20 times its current value (on the basis of grant planning approval for housing). I object to this strongly.
• Existing infrastructure, already under pressure will in no way benefit from increased residential accommodation in the area. There appears to be no provision for more schools or doctors surgeries to offset this increase in population. I object to this on the basis it is unsuitable in the extreme.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7335  **Respondent:** 15641281 / Paula Redmond  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which permit the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the last minute, a more appropriate and equivalent brownfield site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11 May 2016.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. A Habitats Assessment has been carried out but there is absolutely no mention of wildlife species affected in the report. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4). Bats are specially protected and no specific assessment has been carried out in accordance with the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hour no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7351  Respondent: 15641569 / Trevalyn Gregory  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because it was sprung on the village at the last moment with only 2 weeks’ notice and without any prior consultation and is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 sq m at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 sq m of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40ha site available.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because the site has a particular conservation sensitivity since it is covered in ancient woodland. Trees which existed in the 16th century would be endangered. The site is also subject to flooding.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7355  Respondent: 15641665 / John Savin  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

With regard to commercial floorspace provision, I strongly object to this being sited at Garlick’s Arch. Commercial floorspace should be directed to existing employment areas of the Borough such as Slyfield, where there is sufficient space to accommodate the quantum of floorspace apparently required, rather than release greenfield land for development in a rural location.

Overall, whilst it is appreciated that new housing is required in the Borough, I question the need for new employment floorspace on the basis of the existing level of vacancies in the local area. I also strongly believe that the Local Plan should not be an opportunity for the Council to ride rough-shod over established planning policy without a careful and detailed assessment of all the alternative options for development.

I respectfully request that my objections as detailed above are taken into account in the context of the Local Plan Review.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7366  Respondent: 15644225 / Patricia Savin  Agent:

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
With regard to commercial floorspace provision, I strongly object to this being sited at Garlick’s Arch. Commercial floorspace should be directed to existing employment areas of the Borough such as Slyfield, where there is sufficient space to accommodate the quantum of floorspace apparently required, rather than release greenfield land for development in a rural location.

Overall, whilst it is appreciated that new housing is required in the Borough, I question the need for new employment floorspace on the basis of the existing level of vacancies in the local area. I also strongly believe that the Local Plan should not be an opportunity for the Council to ride rough-shod over established planning policy without a careful and detailed assessment of all the alternative options for development.

I respectfully request that my objections as detailed above are taken into account in the context of the Local Plan Review.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7469  Respondent: 15649345 / Matthew Sarti  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Garlicks Arch development A43, which will place unnecessary strain on local infrastructure and has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances to alter the green belt. The site also includes ancient woodland, is subject to flooding and currently supports the rural economy through small businesses. It will particularly increase traffic through West Clandon accessing the A3 and M25. This site is billed as being an enabling site due to its potential to provide an on and off slip for the A3 north and southbound respectively. This has not been agreed by Highways England, may not be in the best location and will not be progressed until some time after Garlick’s Arch has been developed due to the finances required, thus impacting on the road network substantially.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7530  Respondent: 15650369 / Stephanie Dean  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick’s Arch.

This site had been previously considered and rejected before the previous draft of the Plan. The site was then inserted in the Draft Plan only hours before its publication without any consultation. I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site. This is a cavalier approach to public engagement by the Council.
1. The site is not a sustainable site, being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

1. The site is susceptible to flooding and development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and near the site. See my comment on Policy P4 above.

1. The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

1. The Council appears to view the development as an enabling site to obtain land and developer funding for slip roads on/off the A3. This is not an exceptional circumstance to justify taking Green Belt land. The slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the Plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential, Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

1. The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A-road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement, often at speed. (During the last week of the consultation period of this Plan, a resident of West Clandon had his car written off by a negligent car driver coming the other way and occupying 2/3 of the road at an obvious pinch point which is typically littered with broken wing mirrors.) It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, a primary school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road more congested and unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians.

1. Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford. There is vague talk in the plan of link roads between Gosden Hill and Garlick’s Arch, all meeting at an enlarged A3 intersection at Burnt Common. The existing intersection is unlit and is accident prone. Adding two or three slip or feeder roads at this point will add to the confusion and public danger.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7532  Respondent: 15651009 / Miranda Pigram  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch for 400 houses because the plan was sprung on the village without any prior consultation and only 2 weeks’ notice. The development is not required in terms of housing need either for the village or the borough.

I object to the proposed industrial development of 7,000 m² at Garlick’s Arch because it is simply not required since the latest Employment Land Needs Assessment 2015 (ELNA) shows a reduction of 80% in required employment floor space from the previous draft plan. If there is a need for 7,000 m² of industrial space it should be at Slyfield where there is a 40 ha site available.
I have been a resident to Send Marsh for over 20 years and I am writing to object to the latest change made by Guildford Borough Council concerning the Draft Local plan for Send, in particular the designation of the Garlicks Arch site.

This objection is on grounds that not only is this site unsuitable for a number of reasons of which I will elaborate throughout the course of this email, but that the manner in which this last minute amendment to the local plan has been executed, which I do not believe has been carried out in a fair and transparent manner; considering the time-frame, the extent of the amendment and finally the lack of consultation with residents, Parish council and the necessary regulatory bodies concerned with proposed development.

Firstly I would like to bring your attention to the application 16/P/00783 on Oldlands Field Yard, a small area of the recently earmarked site for mass development on the Garlick's Arch site, of which there is a proposal for 9, two storey dwellings that was filed almost exactly a month (12th April) prior to this latest last minute amendment to the local draft plan on 11th May. This appears to be too much of a coincidence and exemplifies the seeming lack of transparency and stealth tactics employed by Guildford Borough Council and developers in seeking approval to develop part of the site in question, which would provide a 'foot in the door development' and platform to further develop the wider site and strengthen the case for the inclusion of the Garlick's Arch site within the draft local plan. Furthermore, there is evidence to support this possibly cynical view in the possibly over-comprehensive extent of accompanying reports to the 9 dwelling development, and the transport modelling being undertaken by Surrey County Council and Highways England, which would reveal that GBC have known about the change in site designation for the local plan and benefits afforded by the initial 9 dwelling development for some time. There has however been a lack of publicity and public consultation for both these cases, and the change in site designation in the amendment comes 8 working days prior to the full council meeting - surely unacceptable in view of the above and considering the extent of the change and impact of an additional 300 dwellings on both the villages of Send and Ripley. If not mandatory, surely there is a duty of care to notify the residents of these areas affected for even the site being included provisionally, despite the 6 week allotted public consultation period after the decision reached on 24th May.

If we are to evaluate the previously executed studies by GBC with regards to the Greenbelt strategy, and the Mass development and Village expansion evaluation - this change in site designation to Garlick’s Arch seems to be contradictory. The site in question is deemed to be medium sensitivity in terms of Greenbelt yet it is being considered for mass development when there are not only low sensitivity areas available in close proximity but a list of brownfield sites - arguably in more strategic locations with regards to the industrial designation of the site, available for re-use in for example, Slyfield, as per the 'previously developed site' report also published by GBC. In the mass development study and village expansion survey it evaluates that Ripley is unsuitable - how then can a development site of this scale be promoted in the local plan that will implicate Ripley for the very reasons that deemed it unsuitable? These sites cannot be treated in isolation, and this site at Garlick's Arch straddles both parish council zones and will have wide-ranging implications for the residents and well-being of not only Ripley and Send, but also Clandon.

With regard to the 'exceptional circumstances' required by borough council to justify removing Greenbelt for development, as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework - on what basis are the reasons given (as per the local plan amendment, of meeting the needs of housing stock) when this housing need is not proven? It is forecast that the population of the Guildford borough is actually set to plateau and decrease (and any statistics contrary to this are surely inflated by the false counting of university students who do not reside past their degree period), so surely therefore no need to increase the 13,860 houses already proposed for the borough by 300 in this development, and certainly no local need in Send to expand the Village by 25%.
This view is further reinforced in terms of the employment floor space designated for the development of 7000 sqm since the ELNA shows a reduction of 80% required from the previous draft plan. Surely from a strategic perspective the site at Syfield is more suited for this type of development, should 7000 sqm still be deemed necessary. One of the reasons for the preservation of Greenbelt is preventing Urban sprawl and preventing the merging of towns and settlements - the site at Garlick's Arch, once fully developed would represent the single largest development in the area, not only in isolation but also if coupled by the Send Marsh Road/ Linden Way housing estate positioned opposite, only separated by the Portsmouth Road. Surely there is no justification for development for Garlick's Arch purely on the basis of the site location opposite an already large housing development as this would go against reducing sprawl and the merging of settlements, and of course the lack of accompanying local amenities - all of which, at present, are out of walking distance.

The implications on-site are also elements of the development proposal for Garlick's Arch which seem to have been overlooked, despite having been identified through both the Mass development and Village expansion analysis carried out by GBC. The site is not only Greenbelt land but also has 4.6 hectares of permanently protected ancient woodland which requires Forestry commission consultation and approval for any development in close proximity to in the first instance. Has the council considered this or given any thought to the implications the removal or damage to this woodland will have on not only the UK's ancient woodland stock but to the damage to local biodiversity and habitats of wildlife? Other site implications identified in the report are the risk of flooding due to the high spatial priority flood plane which cuts across the site from SE to NW. Surely then GBC cannot agree to develop the site on moral and practical grounds due to this known risk but also from the point of providing housing offer that lacks quality considering its close proximity to the A3 of which this development and accompanying junction alone will increase the traffic-based noise which will implicate the quality of life for those resident.

The impact of this site on congestion and road traffic is another element which seems to have been overlooked by GBC. Whilst there is assessed benefits by GBC in the 11th May amendment of an additional junction onto the A3, surely this is short-sighted considering the resulting increased congestion on not only the A3 from this but also on the surrounding local roads of which, during traffic gridlocks, will be used by road users to avoid the A3. In addition, as identified by GBC in a congestion and traffic strategy report published in 2014, the Wisley A3/M25 interchange is already a bottle-neck for traffic congestion. Needless to say, an increase in motorists from not only the development at Burpham of 2000 new homes but also Wisley of 2000 homes, plus of at least 400 from not only in the area as a result of the Garlick's Arch development who may join at Ripley, but also of those joining the A3 one junction prior to this bottleneck from neighbouring Send, Clandon and Woking. It should also be highlighted that the increase in industrial based motor transit from the industrial designation of the site, will almost certainly exacerbate this identified bottle-neck.

At a micro scale, The Portsmouth Road adjacent to the site and in particular the junction with Send Marsh road of which this new development is within 350 yards of, already experiences a high level of congestion and traffic red zone during peak times. This development will not only exacerbate this issue through the increase in a potential average of 400 extra cars resident to the site, but also visitors to the site, and the increased volume of those turning in and out of the site will create further traffic flow disruption to the Portsmouth Road. The Send Marsh Road junction in question has also been the site of many traffic accidents in the past few years and the development of this site will further increase the risk of future road incidents. A counter argument which may be raised by GBC to an increase in car congestion resulting from this site - taking into account the proximity to bus stops and train stations, is surely invalid considering the infrequency of the buses that service this area (hourly or two hourly respectively) and the distance and time taken to walk to the nearest Train station at Clandon - a 1.7 mile journey which would take approx 30 min walk when 20 min walking journey is recommended to local hubs which provide transport linkages to nearest urban centre. Notwithstanding this, the conditions for walking to this station are unsuitable considering the quality of the pavement service, the termination of the pavement at various points along the Clandon road, and the lack of adequate street lighting to enable a commuter to comfortably and safely get there and back on foot.

The scale of the change as a result of the change in site designation is also something that requires scrutinising - nowhere in the amendment issued on the 11th May does it justify why firstly a net increase of 300 dwellings is required, in light of the previously agreed designation in the previous addition of the local plan of circa 100 dwellings, or responsive to any statistics; considering that there have been past assurances from councillors stating that this very situation would not re-emerge, or provides insight into how this will be supported locally or assesses the impacts on the local infrastructure and amenities. Has the council given any thought to how the local doctors surgery or shops in both Send and Ripley will cope with at least 400 additional households to support?
If we are to further assess the potential impact of this mass development in terms of education provision, it is already well known and publicised that this area of Surrey is well oversubscribed. The increase in 400 dwellings will not just place further strain on this system but will be untenable considering that during the period 2014/15, not only the schools within catchment area of this site but within a circa 15-20 mile radius, currently experience an average ratio of 2 applicants per place for both primary and secondary education. Any increase in student yield therefore, despite the ratio of students per household forecasted in the accompanying education infrastructure statement, will place further strain on the education provision, and with no known strategy publicised which identifies this problem or an accompanying local school development or expansion program in relation to this site, something will have to give and one could suggest at least in the short term that this will be the quality of education offer available.

These are pertinent points which require careful thought in relation to the sustainability of the Guildford Borough as a place for quality of life offer in the long term, in particular the areas of Ripley and Send. Mass development proposals in unsuitable locations and on unnecessary scales such as this cannot be justified when this places the very reason people want to live in this area and wider borough, at risk.

To summarise:

I object to the site designation at Garlick’s Arch

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7540  Respondent: 15652833 / Don Babington  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).
The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be reliant on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. There is a danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the proposal to build 7,000 sq m of light industrial, general industrial or warehousing on the site at Garlick’s Arch. There is no need to place a Strategic Employment Site in this location when there is plenty of spare space available at Slyfield (40 ha). The Employment Land Needs Assessment (ELNA) 2015 has been reduced by 80% since the ELNA 2013. There is no longer any need to place industrial development in the Green Belt when there are plenty of brownfield sites available.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road & Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces. Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become an ever popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1) which requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.
Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object on the grounds of the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy 12). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1853</th>
<th>Respondent: 15657057 / Frances Turner</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh**

I object to the proposed allocation for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt. There is insufficient services infrastructure for housing and show people plots, nor any justification for concentrating 6 of the proposed 8 borough-wide show people plots within Send. The road network is insufficient for housing development on this scale and for extra large vehicles associated with show people's livelihood.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7608</th>
<th>Respondent: 15657121 / Robert Wheeler</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlicks Arch

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: PSLPS16/7645  Respondent: 15658497 / Philip Williams  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly over exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7701  Respondent: 15664609 / Diane Pengilly  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

The plan does not adequately fulfil the flood risks as advised by National Planning Policy. The Environmental Agency have stated that the site at Garlick's Arch (A43) is a higher flood risk than stated in the Council's Plan and this area has flooded many times in the past. I object strongly that the Council would ignore this considering the flood issues we have experienced increasingly over recent years!

I object to the destruction of Ancient Woodland and the wildlife that lives there. The Council have spent hundreds of thousands of pounds in Surrey redeveloping woodland and heathland to encourage indigenous species and I can't understand why they turn about face to destroy green belt now...? To destroy over 80 oak trees when oak trees are under threat in this country currently...

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7708  Respondent: 15665697 / Elizabeth Cross  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43.30 the proposed development of Garlicks Arch designated for 400 houses and an industrial estate. This is a new site not included in the Regulation 18 draft and has NOT been consulted on previously. It is not only permanently protected green belt but also a site of ancient woodland with some trees planted in the 16th century. The site floods and is covered by ancient woodland. The industrial space is not needed but if it were it should be at Slyfield. Guildford’s housing requirements have been shown to be grossly over exaggerated and they have refused to disclose their calculations. With proper use of brownfield sites this Green Belt is not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
**Comment ID:** PSLPS16/7722  **Respondent:** 15666113 / Barrat David Wilson Homes (Nick Keeley)  **Agent:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Land at Aldertons Farm and SANG land due west of Aldertons Farm**

In respect of the ‘Land at Aldertons Farm’, despite previous support from GBC the removal of the allocation from the previous draft is not supported. Compelling reasons for the site’s inclusion were previously put forward, accepted by GBC and still very much remain in place and we believe that the site is capable of providing a sensible option for growth within the Borough to help contribute towards the housing need in the immediate to short term. In addition, the previously allocated SANG provision would provide a key piece of infrastructure that would allow new homes to occupied without any reliance on any third party landowner. This SANG, the design of which has been approved in principle by Natural England, would provide 8ha of new publicly accessible open space for the benefit of new residents of any potential development and existing residents of the Village. The delivery of this SANG is further enhanced by the fact that both the residential and SANG components are under a single ownership which demonstrates deliverability.

In summary and to reiterate:–

Aldertons Farm is for a 6.2ha site situated to the east of Aldertons Farm south of Send Marsh Road, Send Marsh. Barratt David Wilson Developments has a contractual arrangement with the landowners and as such, the site is deliverable once consent is issued and all planning conditions and obligations have been met. Barratt David Wilson Homes is one of the largest housing developers in the UK and has the funds available to make an immediate detailed planning application on this land should it be allocated. This site has the following benefits:

- It is available and deliverable in the short term (1-5 years)
- It is surrounded by residential properties on 3 sides
- It has an existing access off Send Marsh Road
- Capacity to provide for circa 120 residential units
- The site is in a sustainable location for housing
- Low risk flood zone (zone 1)
- No major ecology constraints
- No harm to the setting of Aldertons Farm
- Mature landscaping to key perimeter boundaries
- Adjoining SANG at Aldertons Farm (Site 106 – July 2014 draft LP) Design agreed in principle with Natural England. The SANG also has the capacity to allow other sites within 4km to come forward, therefore unlocking further supply.

Barratt David Wilson Homes (Southern Counties) has a proven track record of delivering high quality residential development in the south east of England and would seek to implement any planning consent on this land without delay, providing more certainty on delivery in years 1-5 of the plan period.

In terms of the present Green Belt status of the site, Paragraph 80 of the NPPF reinforces the five purposes of the Green Belt, as follows:–

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
Whilst any proposed development of the site at Aldertons Farm would clearly increase the size of Send Marsh, concerns over an ‘unrestricted sprawl’ would be allayed by the neighbouring SANG land which would likely be transferred to the council and thus preserve the status of the countryside to the western boundary. With the land abutting existing residential to the other 3 boundaries there is a clear, defined boundary with which to check any sprawl. The sites location would not lead to any pressure of merging with neighbouring towns.

The approach towards the allocation of smaller sites within the document is supported, as it assists in helping to bring a range of locations and options for growth to the Borough at a more measured and sustainable rate and a more certain supply of housing to allow time for the strategic sites to be delivered later on in the plan period.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7723</th>
<th>Respondent: 15666113 / Barrat David Wilson Homes (Nick Keeley)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Appraisal – ‘Land at Aldertons Farm’**

The Council have published their Sustainability Appraisal (June 2016) alongside the draft plan and the intention is that this SA ‘identifies, describes and evaluates’ the likely significant effects of implementing both the plan, and the ‘reasonable alternatives’.

The overall content of the SA demonstrates how the approach to ‘reasonable alternatives’ has been carried out and within the document, Table 6.2 ‘Spatial Strategy Alternatives’ reveals that a total of 8 Options were considered which all reflected the OAN with a range of alternative % buffers added. In 7 of the 8 Options the ‘Land at Aldertons Farm’ was included (Send Marsh amber rated sites) within the aggregate housing total and identified as one of the spatial strategy alternatives. With this being so, ‘Alderton’s Farm’ was clearly assessed and determined to be a viable option for growth by GBC in several OAN scenarios and indeed, within the SA, Section 6.3 ‘A stepwise process to develop reasonable alternatives’, the alternative spatial strategies were assessed against both growth and location options and a footnote on page 29 to the comment of ‘best performing site of the three sites at Send’, states that:-

‘Aldertons Farm (c.100 homes) benefits from being located to the north of the village, away from the A3 (recognising the objective of avoiding continuous development along the A3 and maintaining the gap to Guildford.’

In light of the above, the decision therefore to omit ‘Aldertons Farm’ from its previous allocation appears at odds with the assessment given within the SA. The late decision to allocate ‘Land at Garlicks Arch’ (Allocation ref A43) in place of this appears contrary to ‘avoiding continuous development along the A3’ given its location and in a similar vein to strategic allocations elsewhere in the Borough, is subject to significant infrastructure coming forward to enable development. Namely, a new slip road and junction on to the A3 close to Burnt Common. Again, this places serious concerns over the reliability of supply derived from this site, particularly in the short term. Without getting into too much detail it is unclear whether the capacity of this site has been robustly tested. There are a number of technical constraints that need to be considered such as flood risk, noise disturbance and the presence of ancient woodland which could reduce the development footprint. It is also unclear if Highways England support new access arrangements onto the A3 in this location. It should be noted too that Allocation A43 was included at late notice and without prior consultation before it was reported to the Full Council meeting in May 2016.

In terms of comparing ‘Aldertons Farm’ with other sites that could come forward from ‘Inset villages and infill development within identified Green Belt villages’ within the SA, an accompanying ‘Site options Appraisal findings’ matrix is included within the appendices. When reviewing ‘Aldertons Farm’ against other sites which have been selected in the ‘Horsley’s’ for example, the number of ‘reds’ and ‘ambers’ are comparable, even though access to some of these other allocations is unclear and are also reliant on SANG within third party control before they can come forward. It
seems perverse that Alderton’s Farm, an unconstrained and immediately deliverable site has been omitted from the plan in favour of site’s which do not appear to have a satisfactory access. (A38, A39 and A40). Whilst these ‘green belt villages’ are rightly identified as a source of supply, there appears little consistent rationale applied to the choice of site for allocation.

In view of the above there are serious concerns over the soundness of the plan in being able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. The latest AMR states within Table 3 ‘Calculation of five year supply’ that only a 1.4 year supply of housing can be demonstrated and that it will not be until 2022/23 (at the earliest) that the OAN figure of 693 is met. From the base date of 2013/14, and just in the first two years of the housing land supply, a deficit of 1007 homes against the OAN figure of 693 has already accumulated.

The allocation of the Alderton Farm site, promoted by a national housebuilder, would provide an immediate source of supply in years 1-5 and go some way to addressing the immediate shortfall.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7731  Respondent: 15666625 / Anna Ruddy  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (Blc), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (BB).

There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick's Arch site.

There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council's own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick's Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy 13).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).
The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy 14)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy 11)

Furthermore, several electricity pylons run through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7736   Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)   Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send Parish Council object to allocation A43 on the grounds that it is not justified. The site is allocated for 400 C3 residential units and up to 7,000 sq m of B1c/B2/B8 employment use, however this major allocation has only been included in the most recent versions of the draft Local Plan and is not supported by the evidence base.

The July 2014 Draft Local Plan allocated three sites in Send, Send Marsh / Burnt Common for whole or partial development for residential purposes. These sites are as follows:

Site 74 - Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send - B employment uses and up to 100 homes
Site 75 - Land at Tannery Lane, Send (including Clockbarn Nurseries) - 215 homes
Site 76 - Land to east of Aldertons Farm, Send Marsh - 116 homes

This 2014 version of the Local Plan allocated a total of 431 homes in Send and Send Marsh / Burnt Common. This is compared to 185 homes allocated in the initial draft of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (dated May 2016) before allocation A43 was changed. This clearly indicates that following the 2014 consultation it was recognised that 431 homes in Send was over development. The reduction to 185 reflects a more appropriate level of development. The last minute change to 485 homes in the most recent version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan represents a significant increase that is clearly unjustified by the evidence base.

After consulting on the Local Plan in July 2014, the Council drafted an updated version of the Local Plan for review by the Council before being published for consultation in June 2016. This version of the draft Local Plan was considered by the Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board (The ‘Board’) on 13 April 2016 and included the following allocations for Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. The Board did not raise any concerns or propose any changes to these allocations:

Site A42 – Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send – 45 homes
Site A43 – Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send – 100 homes with B employment uses
Site A44 – Land West of Winds Ridge – 40 homes

Send Parish Council has previously raised concerns about the suitability of these sites due to the lack of capacity on narrow local roads, but consider an allocation of 185 homes to represent a more appropriate level of development than the 485 now included with the draft Submission Local Plan. The Parish may wish to have the opportunity to allocate appropriate sites through the neighbourhood plan process.
The Guildford Council Executive met on 11 May 2016 to review the draft Proposed Submission Local Plan before it was published for consultation. The draft version of the Plan included the same allocations as were reviewed on 13 April 2016, however as a result of this meeting the decision was made to remove from the draft Local Plan site allocation policy A43 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse and replace it with a new site known as Garlick’s Arch, with proposals for 400 homes and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) uses. The justification for this change is provided as ‘the Interim Director of Development be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the document as he shall deem appropriate’.

The reasons for this last minute change in allocation are wholly unjustified. Firstly, it is unreasonable to consider the proposed changes to be ‘minor’ considering they involve allocating a further 300 homes to a village with a population of only 1,931 and delete the previous allocation around Burnt Common Warehouse that has been carefully considered, consulted upon and adapted since the first iteration of the Local Plan Issues and Options Paper in October 2013. This is a wholly inappropriate approach to the Local Plan making process and represents bad practice.

At no point up to May 2016 had any allocation been made relating to the Garlick’s Arch site. It had been included in the February 2016 Land Availability Assessment ref. 2258, but had not been allocated. Since the site was only identified as a potentially developable site in February 2016 and was not included in drafts of the Proposed Submission Local Plan as late as May 2016, this indicates that insufficient consideration has been given to its allocation.

Section 21 of the January 2013 Green Belt and Countryside Study examined how Green Belt Boundaries could be re-defined around Send Marsh and Burnt Common to accommodate a major settlement expansion. This study includes the land at Garlick’s Arch as plot B14-A. The appraisal recognises that Send Marsh and Burnt Common lack community facilities and would require a significant population increase far beyond what is currently proposed in order to create a ‘critical mass’ of population. This indicates that the current proposal for 400 new homes on the Garlick’s Arch site would introduce homes to a settlement with few facilities, requiring new residents to travel to other settlements for work, shopping and leisure. Indeed, Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Submission Local Plan, in Appendix IV Site Options, appraises all sites considered potentially suitable for allocating in the Local Plan. A traffic light approach is used to appraise individual sites. Allocation A43, Garlick’s Arch, is considered to be the poorest performing of the sites considered potentially suitable in Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common, with red traffic lights against the following criteria: SNCI/LNR; key employment site; flood risk; recreation facility; town/district/local centre or shop; primary school; secondary school; high quality agricultural land; previously developed land; and railway station. In fact, the Sustainability Appraisal considers it to be one of the poorest performing of all sites considered to have potential.

Send Parish Council consider the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse to be a more appropriate allocation that has been given the necessary consideration through the Local Plan consultation process. Despite the late changes outlined above, the Key Diagram contained within the proposed Submission Local Plan (page 18) indicates that land around Burnt Common Warehouse is identified as a Strategic Employment Site rather than that at Garlick’s Arch. The draft Proposed Submission Local Plan was reviewed by the Guildford Borough Executive Committee. The supporting papers for this meetings stated:

“Send Marsh/Burnt Common – this site is located in a yellow (medium) sensitivity land parcel. Our Employment Land Needs Assessment identifies a need for industrial land and this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need”.

No evidence is provided to explain how circumstances changed in the following month before the Local Plan was published for consolation to justify the change in allocation. It would appear from the meeting minutes that this change was only made to accommodate additional housing and a new slip road to the A3, but as this statement demonstrates in sections two, three and four, these changes are unsustainable, unjustified and unnecessary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7878  Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send Parish Council object to allocation A43 on the grounds that it is not justified. The site is allocated for 400 C3 residential units and up to 7,000 sq m of B1c/B2/B8 employment use, however this major allocation has only been included in the most recent versions of the draft Local Plan and is not supported by the evidence base.

The July 2014 Draft Local Plan allocated three sites in Send, Send Marsh / Burnt Common for whole or partial development for residential purposes. These sites are as follows:

Site 74 - Land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send - B employment uses and up to 100 homes
Site 75 - Land at Tannery Lane, Send (including Clockbarn Nurseries) - 215 homes
Site 76 - Land to east of Aldertons Farm, Send Marsh - 116 homes

This 2014 version of the Local Plan allocated a total of 431 homes in Send and Send Marsh / Burnt Common. This is compared to 185 homes allocated in the initial draft of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (dated May 2016) before allocation A43 was changed. This clearly indicates that following the 2014 consultation it was recognised that 431 homes in Send was over development. The reduction to 185 reflects a more appropriate level of development. The last minute change to 485 homes in the most recent version of the Proposed Submission Local Plan represents a significant increase that is clearly unjustified by the evidence base.

After consulting on the Local Plan in July 2014, the Council drafted an updated version of the Local Plan for review by the Council before being published for consultation in June 2016. This version of the draft Local Plan was considered by the Economy and Infrastructure Executive Advisory Board (The ‘Board’) on 13 April 2016 and included the following allocations for Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common. The Board did not raise any concerns or propose any changes to these allocations:

Site A42 â€“ Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send â€“ 45 homes
Site A43 â€“ Land around Burnt Common Warehouse, London Road, Send â€“ 100 homes with B employment uses
Site A44 â€“ Land West of Winds Ridge â€“ 40 homes

Send Parish Council has previously raised concerns about the suitability of these sites due to the lack of capacity on narrow local roads, but consider an allocation of 185 homes to represent a more appropriate level of development than the 485 now included with the draft Submission Local Plan. The Parish may wish to have the opportunity to allocate appropriate sites through the neighbourhood plan process.

The Guildford Council Executive met on 11 May 2016 to review the draft Proposed Submission Local Plan before it was published for consultation. The draft version of the Plan included the same allocations as were reviewed on 13 April 2016, however as a result of this meeting the decision was made to remove from the draft Local Plan site allocation policy A43 Land around Burnt Common Warehouse and replace it with a new site known as Garlick’s Arch, with proposals for 400 homes and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8) uses. The justification for this change is provided as ‘the Interim Director of Development be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make such minor alterations to improve the clarity of the document as he shall deem appropriate’.

The reasons for this last minute change in allocation are wholly unjustified. Firstly, it is unreasonable to consider the proposed changes to be ‘minor’ considering they involve allocating a further 300 homes to a village with a population of only 1,931 and delete the previous allocation around Burnt Common Warehouse that has been carefully considered, consulted upon and adapted since the first iteration of the Local Plan Issues and Options Paper in October 2013. This is a wholly inappropriate approach to the Local Plan making process and represents bad practice.

At no point up to May 2016 had any allocation been made relating to the Garlick’s Arch site. It had been included in the February 2016 Land Availability Assessment ref. 2258, but had not been allocated. Since the site was only identified as a potentially developable site in February 2016 and was not included in drafts of the Proposed Submission Local Plan as late as May 2016, this indicates that insufficient consideration has been given to its allocation.
Section 21 of the January 2013 Green Belt and Countryside Study examined how Green Belt Boundaries could be re-defined around Send Marsh and Burnt Common to accommodate a major settlement expansion. This study includes the land at Garlick’s Arch as plot B14-A. The appraisal recognises that Send Marsh and Burnt Common lack community facilities and would require a significant population increase far beyond what is currently proposed in order to create a ‘critical mass’ of population. This indicates that the current proposal for 400 new homes on the Garlick’s Arch site would introduce homes to a settlement with few facilities, requiring new residents to travel to other settlements for work, shopping and leisure. Indeed, Sustainability Appraisal of the draft Submission Local Plan, in Appendix IV Site Options, appraises all sites considered potentially suitable for allocating in the Local Plan. A traffic light approach is used to appraise individual sites. Allocation A43, Garlick’s Arch, is considered to be the poorest performing of the sites considered potentially suitable in Send, Send Marsh and Burnt Common, with red traffic lights against the following criteria: SNCI/LNR; key employment site; flood risk; recreation facility; town/district/local centre or shop; primary school; secondary school; high quality agricultural land; previously developed land; and railway station. In fact, the Sustainability Appraisal considers it to be one of the poorest performing of all sites considered to have potential.

Send Parish Council consider the Land around Burnt Common Warehouse to be a more appropriate allocation that has been given the necessary consideration through the Local Plan consultation process. Despite the late changes outlined above, the Key Diagram contained within the proposed Submission Local Plan (page 18) indicates that land around Burnt Common Warehouse is identified as a Strategic Employment Site rather than that at Garlickâ€™s Arch. The draft Proposed Submission Local Plan was reviewed by the Guildford Borough Executive Committee. The supporting papers for this meetings stated:

“Send Marsh/Burnt Common – this site is located in a yellow (medium) sensitivity land parcel. Our Employment Land Needs Assessment identifies a need for industrial land and this site is the only suitable and deliverable site identified by the Green Belt and Countryside Study that could meet this need”.

No evidence is provided to explain how circumstances changed in the following month before the Local Plan was published for consolation to justify the change in allocation. It would appear from the meeting minutes that this change was only made to accommodate additional housing and a new slip road to the A3, but as this statement demonstrates in sections two, three and four, these changes are unsustainable, unjustified and unnecessary.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7879  Respondent: 15667489 / Tibbalds (Jon Herbert)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Send Parish Council object to allocation A43 on the grounds that it is not justified. The site is allocated for 400 C3 residential units and up to 7,000 sq m of B1c/B2/B8 employment use, however this major allocation has only been included in the most recent versions of the draft Local Plan and is not supported by the evidence base.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7792  Respondent: 15673185 / Simon Jefferies  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7829</th>
<th>Respondent: 15674273 / Savills for Thames Water (Katherine Jones)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development. It is important not to underestimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed 400 dwellings exceed the capacity trigger levels for available network. Developer funded impact study required to understand implications of development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/7844</th>
<th>Respondent: 15674561 / Andy Stallan (WYG)</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Future Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The eastern part of the BCN site is considered to have potential for both commercial and residential use. It is approximately 4 ha and on the basis of the surrounding area it is considered that up to 100 houses could be accommodated on the eastern part of the site which would equate to a density of approximately 25 dph which would be reasonable for this site given its surrounding context. This density enables a strong landscaped buffer to be created between the existing depot, the A3 and any residential development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to being suitable for commercial purposes due in part to the existing employment development on the site, we consider that the site is suitable for residential purposes as it lies directly adjacent to the existing residential dwellings of Clandon Road, which form part of the residential area of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh. Residential development therefore would be a compatible use of this site. Residential development in this location would be contiguous with the existing residential dwellings of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh in this area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a review of the GBCS both elements of the site fall within a parcel of land (B13-D), which as previously stated, has been identified as a PDA. Paragraph 1.37 of Volume I of the GBCS states that the land parcel in which the site falls within has the potential to accommodate appropriate development without compromising the purposes of the Green Belt in which it is located. It is noted to be an area that is surrounded by defensible boundaries and these include built physical features (roads) and significant tree screening.

The site, and indeed wider land parcel in which it is located is isolated from the wider green belt by the A3, the London Road and the Clandon Road which surround the site, making it an enclosed triangular parcel of land that is very much separated from the wider Green Belt. This helps to further ensure that development of the site (and wider land parcel) would not harm the character or appearance of the Green Belt in which it is located and would not set a precedent. This scenario is very similar to, and is supported by, the Burpham Court Farm development known as Weybrook (now a housing development with a large Sainsbury’s supermarket) which is also between the A3 and an A3 slip road in a triangular shape.

The Council accepted the above and proceeded to allocate the site in the Draft Local Plan for commercial and residential development. The subsequent change was very late in the day.

The tree belts surrounding the site serve an important function when considering the visual impact of the site as well as reinforcing the sites’ isolation from the open Green Belt. Tree belts follow London Road (including within the central reservation) and Clandon Road to the north and east, there is also significant tree cover following the A3 to the south and hedgerows near the commercial area to the east of PDA. This ensures that the site is well screened and as such views of any development would be extremely limited. Additional landscaping will be incorporated into the proposed development to ensure that any perceived areas of weakness in the existing landscaping can strengthened, particularly along its eastern boundary with the existing depot.

The GBCS also notes that the site is relatively unconstrained in environmental capacity terms and as being in an area of existing development. In addition, that assessment was based on a larger site, including more open land to the north of the old A3 London Road. Therefore, the BCN part of the site is even better in itself than the overall site assessed in landscape terms.

This further supports the Council’s own previous conclusions that that development of the identified land parcel (and therefore the site) will not harm the purposes of the Green Belt and is the best site to allocate in this locality.

In terms of impact on existing residential amenity, the site is located at a sufficient distance from surrounding residential dwellings so as not to have an adverse impact on outlook or privacy. Furthermore, the site is well screened by existing mature tree boundaries and this will be enhanced as part of the proposed development. The site is also situated at a slightly lower level from the surrounding area which ensures that any development on the site will not appear overbearing.

As previously stated a landscaped tree buffer will be created between the existing depot and any new residential dwellings to ensure that future residential amenity is protected.

The only residential property which has a direct view towards the site is a single first floor window in Thatched Cottage, which is to the north east of the site. However, due to the extensive tree cover that surrounds the site views from this window are limited, and additional landscaping can be incorporated into any development proposal to ensure that any views are not sufficiently detrimental and built form can be located at an appropriate distance from this boundary to prevent issues of overlooking/ loss of privacy etc.

As previously stated, access can be provided directly from the London Road. It serves the adjacent depot and auction centre and the residential dwellings on Woodhill/ Vicarage Lane. The south-west bound carriageway of the road is wide enough to accommodate two lanes of traffic and the southern side of the road is currently hatched and could be easily modified to safely accommodate the new access. As such it would be possible to provide two lane traffic if required, although this is unlikely as a part of a residential scheme. In terms of traffic generation, there would be an increase, however the direct accessibility onto London Road is a benefit in this regard. Given London Road is a main road (formerly the A3), and experiences relatively low traffic movements, there is capacity to accommodate a moderate
residential and commercial development. Furthermore, it provides direct and efficient access to the A3, A247 and the wider highway network.

Finally, the site is not within an area that is subject to flooding.

Deliverability
In terms of deliverability the site at BCN recommended for progression to the Submission Local Plan, excluding the Ewbanks site, is in single ownership, is available and deliverable with 1-5 years (subject to securing planning permission). It can satisfactorily accommodate the 7000 square metres of employment space and 100 homes. The Newship Groups sister company has significant experience of developing residential estates, ensuring comfort in that respect. The Newship Group has a track record of developing industrial and warehousing development, with sufficient funds, providing further certainty of delivery (this cannot be said of the Garlicks Arch site).

Further comment on the Garlick’s Arch site
The Garlick’s Arch site would provide 400 dwellings, a quantity of employment floorspace (in Use Classes B1c, B2, B8) and a new northbound onslip to the A3 trunk road from Clandon Road (A247) and a new southbound offslip from the A3 trunk road to Clndon Road.

That part of the Garlick’s Arch site on the northern side of the A3 is approx. 31.7ha. This compares with the size of the existing settlement of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh, which occupies approx. 70ha. The Garlick’s Arch site would therefore result in approximately a 50% increase in the size of the village. Given the settlement is described as a rural village, this is an unjustifiable increase in the size of the settlement.

This is the wrong place for employment space. It would be unrelated to any other conventional employment space and result in employment space spread across Burntcommon rather than concentrated in a more logical and appropriate location.

The Local Plan also includes a proposal for the provision of new slip roads onto the A3 to/ from Clndon Road. These are considered necessary highway improvements for one or more of the following:

1. The proposed development;
2. To facilitate other development allocated in the emerging Plan;
3. To facilitate other development envisaged in the emerging Plan.

All new development is required to propose highway measures necessary to make that development acceptable in planning terms, so if the new slip roads onto the A3 are required to make the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch acceptable in planning terms that would not comprise very special circumstances.

A similar conclusion is drawn for point 2 above i.e. to facilitate other development allocated in the emerging Plan. It is the case that new residential development allocated at the Gosden Hill site benefits from access to and from the A3 in all directions as follows:

1. Off slip from A3 southbound at Burpham and then access via New Inn Lane;
2. On-slip onto the A3 northbound via Clay Lane;
3. Off slip from A3 northbound at Burnt Common, A247 through West Clandon; A25 west and then to the Gosden Hill site via Park Lane and Merrow Lane;
4. On-slip onto the A3 southbound at Burnt Common (via the above in reverse).

Thus, there is no demonstration of very special circumstances to facilitate other development allocated in the emerging Plan.

WYG notes that other development envisaged in the Plan includes a long term aim of placing the A3, as it passes through Guildford, in a tunnel. The tunnel would potentially commence in the vicinity of the junction of the A3 with Woking Road and follow a south-westerly alignment, emerging at ground level south of Farnham Road. Whilst this is a very high level and the feasibility of the tunnel has yet to be proven, it would offer a number of benefits to the town, not least of which would be the re-routing of through traffic away from a busy stretch of road that is likely to become more heavily
used as a result of planned new development. The provision of a tunnel also offers the opportunity to connect the two parts of the town and carry out environmental enhancements.

Unfortunately, some vehicles are precluded from travelling through tunnels and measures would need to be provided to enable such vehicles to leave the A3 before entering the tunnel. South of Guildford, a new junction would be required in any case (to enable vehicles to continue travelling south along the A3 or west along the A31). This would not impact upon Burnt Common. At the northern end of the tunnel, a new junction would not need to be provided however, as the existing junction with Woking Road provides a southbound off-slip and northbound on-slip, in addition to the London Road/A3100/Clay Lane existing slip roads.

As a result, it is the case that a new southbound off-slip and northbound on-slip are not required at Burnt Common to facilitate the tunnel under the A3.

As a result, the proposed allocation at Garlick’s Arch does not offer any very special circumstances that warrant a development of the size indicated in the emerging Plan. The allocations for both the slip roads and the Garlicks Arch site should therefore be removed from the Local Plan.

Should new slip roads onto the A3 to/ from Clandon Road be required by Highways England, these could in any case be provided without developing the Garlick’s Arch site. The land could be safeguarded pending a review of the Plan, which would in any case be required once Highways England determine whether the A3 at Guildford is to be widened or placed into a tunnel. This is the appropriate approach to take and recognised on page 9 of the Transport Strategy for the Borough:

‘Our proposed draft Local Plan will ensure that development at the Gosden Hill Farm site will safeguard the ability to create an all-movements A3 junction to the east of Guildford, until such time as Highways England determine whether or not this is required for their A3 Guildford scheme.’

Thus, there is no requirement in highway and transport terms to allocate the Garlick’s Arch site at this time.

Furthermore, development of the GA site would result in a significant adverse impact on the Green Belt due to the topography and open character of the site, which rises to the south and west, from a low point at the north-eastern end. There are clear and expansive views into and over the site from a range of locations around the site. As a result of its topography and the views into and across the site it has a significant beneficial impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The site contributes to the purpose and function of the Green Belt.

As a result, development on the site would significantly reduce openness, harming a key purpose and function of the Green Belt.

One of the reasons for removing the Burnt Common site in favour of the GA site, as referred to earlier in this letter, was to afford greater separation between Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm. This is erroneous and an illogical conclusion for the following reasons:

- The Burnt Common Nurseries site is already partly developed;
- The Burnt Common Nurseries site is well contained and enclosed from views from the A3;
- The Burnt Common Nurseries site is smaller than the Garlick’s Arch site and contains features that are not characteristic of the rural landscape;
- The Garlick’s Arch site in comparison contains features that are characteristic of the rural landscape and is in agricultural use;
- There is a change in levels;
- A large part of the Garlick’s Arch boundary is un-vegetated which offers an open and unrestricted view into the site, particularly from the south-east;
- The lack of boundary vegetation at the Garlick’s Arch site allows visibility into the site on a scale not possible at Burnt Common Nurseries.
Thus, the development of the Garlick’s Arch site would have a greater adverse impact on the Green Belt and lead to a reduction in the separation between Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm to a greater degree and extent than if the Burnt Common Nurseries site is developed as proposed.

Furthermore, the Ewbank’s auctions westernmost triangle of land could be excluded from the allocation; with a suitably landscaped boundary between the allocated site and the Ewbank’s auctions site, there would be a consequent increase in separation between Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm.

The Garlick’s Arch site is too large for the size, character and function of the settlement; it is not required to enable an improved junction onto and from the A3 north of Guildford and there are significant Green Belt and landscape constraints indicating the site should not be developed.

This compares with the Burnt Common site, which is enclosed and development on the site would not result in a loss of openness or impact on the purpose and function of the Green Belt.

The Garlick’s Arch site contains areas of ancient woodland that could be fragmented by development of the site.

This compares with the Burnt Common site, which does not contain environmental designations; the ancient woodland adjacent to the BCN site would be retained and linked to the wider area through strengthened tree belts. Development of the Burnt Common site would be at a low density, allowing space for existing flora and fauna and enhance biodiversity through the provision of a range of habitats in close proximity, including trees, hedgerows, open grassland, a pond and areas of undisturbed ground. Finally, this would all be provided within an enclosed setting that would not result in light pollution or a significant increase in artificial light; thus respecting the environment for the future.

The proposed residential development of the Burnt Common Nurseries site potentially includes children’s play facilities, a village green and space around the dwellings. The commercial development is separated from the residential dwellings by the existing warehouse, which is well enclosed and screened by existing vegetation. This will be supplemented to strengthen wildlife links to and from the ancient woodland and residential development would not be located unacceptably close to existing noise generating sources.

Finally, the provision of a range of residential and commercial development that is proportionate and commensurate with the size, character and function of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh, benefits the local area without having a serious adverse impact on local services and facilities. It is clear therefore that a development of this type contributes to the three main aims of sustainable development – social, economic and environmental.

Conclusion
It is considered that given the subject sites’ location, its sustainability credentials, housing need in the Borough and the assessments of the GBCS it represents a prime opportunity for residential and commercial development that it has been demonstrated is proportionate and commensurate with the size, character and function of the existing settlement.

It is considered that up to 100 dwellings could be achieved on the eastern portion of the site, which would represent a suitably low density of development. This in turn enables the site to retain an open and spacious character, and retention and sympathetic enhancement to the existing ancient woodland through strengthening the tree belts around the site to provide wildlife corridors to adjacent areas.

It is considered that the Council should re-allocate the Burnt Common Nurseries site in the emerging Local Plan for the following summary reasons:

• The site is in a sustainable location – BCN site placed first whilst GA site last in GB&CS 2014;
• The Council considers that the village can accommodate future development, commensurate to its size, character and function. The proposed allocation at BCN is commensurate to the size, character and function of Burntcommon and Sendmarsh;
• There is a real need for housing in Guildford. Currently the Council do not have a 5 year supply of housing and have no reasonable prospect of achieving this for some years through existing allocations. Therefore, in accordance with the NPPF the Council should consider favourably proposals for housing where the principles of
sustainable development can be achieved. This is particularly the case where sites are identified as being deliverable and capable of providing a high proportion of affordable dwellings;
• There is a real need for commercial development on this site in the form of B1(c), B2 and B8 uses as acknowledged by the Council and supported by Lambert Smith Hampton;
• The BCN site is an existing partly previously developed commercial employment site. It makes much more sense to consolidate employment at Burnt Common in one location, rather than spread it over two.
• The Council twice previously identified and allocated the site for future housing and employment development in the emerging Plan, demonstrating its acceptable credentials;
• Residential use of the site would be compatible with adjacent land uses and form a natural extension of and be contiguous with the residential environment of Burnt Common/ Send Marsh, which is listed in the settlement hierarchy as a large village;
• Commercial development would be most logical on this site due to the existing employment development on the site and Newship Group experience;
• The site has defensible boundaries which will ensure that its development will not harm the purposes or openness of the wider Green Belt;
• Separation to Gosden Hill Farm can be achieved by removal of the Ewbanks auction part of the previous allocation;
• The site is similar to the previously developed site Weybrook in Burpham (now a housing development with a Sainsbury’s supermarket) which also lies between the A3 and a slip road.
• The site is isolated from the wider Green Belt, being a very enclosed site in functional, landscape and visual terms;
• The site is not constrained by any other sensitive planning designations;
• There were relatively few objections to the previous allocation of the BCN site in the 2014 Plan. This position has been supported in our recent discussions with both Send Parish Council and those residents involved in Save Ripley, both of whom, as we understand it, support our site as opposed to the Garlicks Arch site. The relative weight of public opinion should be strongly taken into account when concluding on the best site in this area;
• The BCN site is deliverable within 1 – 5 years, demonstrated also by the existing single owners experience and their employment development credentials;
• The BCN site would not impact materially on any existing residential properties;
• The BCN site is well screened already by mature tree planting;
• The BCN site is located around and between existing development – residential to the east and commercial to the west;
• Allocation of the Garlick’s Arch site would potentially result in much of the local road network in Send/ Ripley exceeding its theoretical operational capacity should highway improvements not be provided;
• The inclusion of the proposed new slip roads at Garlick’s Arch would result in significant levels of traffic re-routing locally (i.e. along the A247) and would therefore still not materially improve the local highway network overall;
• The inclusion of the slip roads at Garlick’s Arch would not have a material direct benefit to the local or strategic highway network and would simply result in the rerouting of traffic elsewhere (i.e. the A247 Clandon Road) to the detriment of other parts of the local highway network;
• There is no need for the Garlick’s Arch site to be allocated in the emerging Plan at this time and if necessary, the site/ appropriate land could be safeguarded for highway improvements to the A3 as part of a review of the Plan once Highways England determine the optimum solution for the A3 through Guildford;
• The Garlick’s Arch site is too large for the size, character and function of the settlement; it is not required to enable an improved junction onto and from the A3 north of Guildford and there are significant Green Belt and landscape constraints indicating the site should not be developed; and
• If other strategic sites in the Green Belt (such as Wisley) not be allocated for development, the Burnt Common Nurseries site becomes all the more relevant and necessary to enable the Council to achieve its objectives.

With all of the above in mind we strongly assert that the most logical, reliable, commensurate and credible allocation for employment space, with the least constraints, is the land around the existing Burnt Common Warehouse.

It is suitable, developable and deliverable for both commercial and residential development. As such the site should be included in the Council’s Submission Local Plan and excluded from the Green Belt in any Green Belt review.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7846  Respondent: 15674561 / Andy Stallan (WYG)  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Allocation of Sites - Burnt Common Nurseries site should be allocated in the Submission Plan

Please refer to the accompanying separate representation submission letter dated 15th July 2016 for details

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7845  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

In particular, the site at Garlick’s Arch (A43) is classified by the Environment Agency as being in a higher risk than the Council’s own assessment. This area has flooded many times in recent years and therefore the Council’s assessment is not good enough to be included in the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7848  Respondent: 15674689 / Chris Baker  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43) Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.
The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- It has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7924  Respondent: 15687201 / Mandy Cox  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for it’s removal from the Green Belt (Policy P2). Central Government state clearly that housing need is not an exceptional circumstance.

The Plan states the preference is to use of previously developed land, but GBC have removed a brownfield site at Burnt Common replaced it with Garlick’s Arch.

The site is not appropriate because:

- There is no sustainable transport infrastructure.
- The site is liable to frequent flooding.
- The site has Ancient woodland and is a wildlife habitat, but no wildlife report for the site is in the Plan.
- There are no plans to improve local schools, medical or utilities to cope.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7999  Respondent: 15697921 / Chris Smedmore  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of the site A43 at Garlicks Arch. The scale of development proposed is disproportionate both to the size and character of the villages of Send and Ripley and also in respect of the borough as a whole, with far too much development focused in one area. The site is liable to flooding and not supported by adequate infrastructure to enable sustainable methods of transport, meaning new residents will have a high reliance on cars. Many of the routes between Ripley, Clandon and the surrounding areas are tiny country lanes, which are in poor condition and do not accommodate traffic in both directions at once. The main routes through Clandon, Ripley and Send are already highly congested during rush hours and at other times of the day, particularly where problems arise on the A3. The route through...
Clandon in particular is barely wide enough in places to allow the passing in both directions of heavy goods vehicles. I have seen no plans for additional railway stations to support sustainable travel around these developments and Highways England has no plans to improve the A3/M25 trunk roads (which are already severely strained) within the timeframes necessary to accommodate this plan.

The huge number of houses and large industrial space proposed will stretch the local villages’ amenities (utilities, doctors and schools are already close to or at capacity), cause further traffic problems on routes that are already severely strained during busy periods and harm the environment in a greenbelt area surrounded by ancient woodland, which is home to an abundance of wildlife, including some protected species.

There has been no adequate consultation on this additional development, which was added late to the draft in May 2016.

The industrial site is an unnecessary addition to this area, where there are seemingly other sites available which are far more appropriate for this type of development, in particular around Slyfield, which is already industrialised and would not pose such a threat to protected areas and wildlife habitats.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8001  Respondent: 15698017 / Katie Taylor  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

- There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt, as required by national policy. Housing need is not enough to constitute exceptional circumstances.
- The scale of the development proposed is far too large as the neighbouring villages do not have the infrastructure to support the proposed number of houses. Schools are already at or near capacity and there inadequate railway facilities or bus routes to prevent an inevitable over reliance on cars. There is no infrastructure schedule for Garlick’s Arch, so the Plan takes no account of the infrastructure required for this site and is therefore not fit for purpose.
- The roads in Send, Ripley and Clandon are not sufficient to cope with additional traffic flow that would inevitably arise from a development of this size. The proposed inclusion of an industrial estate is likely to increase the use of the roads by heavy goods vehicles and the roads, which are already in poor condition are unlikely to be able to support this. The extra traffic will also have a severely detrimental impact on the environment.
- The woodland surrounding Garlick’s Arch is centuries old, includes a number of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders and is home to many species of wildlife. Development on the scale proposed is likely to severely damage animal habitats. I have been unable to locate a wildlife report carried out on this site and it seems the severe environmental impacts of the proposed developments have not been properly considered.
- The land is also susceptible to flooding and this does not seem to have been properly taken into account, with the Environment Agencies flood risk ratings being higher than that specified by the Council.
- There has been no adequate consultation on this development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8007  Respondent: 15698753 / Anna Calvert  Agent: 

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8013</th>
<th>Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the late inclusion of site A43 Garlick’s Arch and any development on it. This area is covered by ancient woodland and the site floods. Any industrial space needed is better placed at Slyfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8015</th>
<th>Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the Garlick’s Arch development since it will contribute to sprawl and destroy the countryside.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the Garlick’s Arch development because the extra traffic cannot be accommodated on local roads. At least 1000 cars will be injected into the road system that’s already jammed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: PSLPS16/8017</th>
<th>Respondent: 15700353 / Edward Warren</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the development of Garlick’s Arch due to the destruction of the ancient woodland.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43 | Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( ) | |
| | I object to the Garlick’s Arch industrial development because the figures reportedly show a reduction in the need for this kind of development and yet Garlick’s Arch was slipped into the Local Plan despite non-greenbelt land being available. | |
| | I object to the Garlick’s Arch development due to the tendency of the land to flood | |
| | What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document? | |
I object to the erosion of the greenbelt, the development of the Garlicks Arch area and especially the development of an on/off ramp to the A3 at West Clandon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the proposed development of the Garlick’s Arch site at Burnt Common for at least 400 homes plus industrial site. There is insufficient infrastructure in the surrounding villages of Clandon and Ripley to make this development viable. Further, it is not appropriate to clear the ancient woodland and the accompanying habitat for this development.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

The site is not appropriate because, there are no plans to improve schools, surgeries, or utilities.

Garlick’s Arch is protected from development as Green Belt, and I do not believe there are valid 'exceptional circumstances' for its removal.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

These developments will inevitably lead to a merging of all the areas which are at present separate entities, Wisley Airfield, Ripley including Garlick's Arch to Send and on to Clandon and Burpham. We wish to remain villages - we all live here because they are villages. The development is far too concentrated in this part of the borough and GBC has made it a feature of their plan with larger numbers than other Borough Councils in Surrey. I therefore object to the Borough Wide Strategy (Policy S2) and the SHMA figure of 693 houses per year as being too high (Appendix D).

Garlick's Arch is at risk of flooding and is classified by the Environment Agency as being at higher risk than the Council's assessment. I object to development in areas which are at risk of flooding (Policy P4). The original plan had included land at Burnt Common where there was a brownfield site this new site is absolutely wrong as it has ancient woodland and GBC's Green Belt & Countryside Report does not even cover this site. (A43) Ripley and Send together only have about 3000 households and the development would damage the historic environment as a result of the scale of the proposed development (Policy D3).

With lack of good air quality due to congestion especially in the construction stage, although even now there are problems with the numbers of diesel vehicles especially HGVs, I have concerns about healthy living. (Policy I3) This is a great place to live, but GBC is intent on destroying it.

Please take my objections into consideration and amend the Plan so that housing sites are reduced in this area for not only are we surrounded by all of this proposed by GBC, we also have to live with extra traffic due to a proposal by Woking Borough Council for houses only a mile or so away at Pyrford. This is not NIMBYism but a cry for help as you will destroy our way of life entirely.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4090  Respondent: 15705761 / David Jenner  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Garlick's Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl, half a mile away from where I live. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople sites in A43 Garlick's Arch as the development only includes 400 houses and therefore no provision is necessary as this is not compliant with the minimum of 500 as stated in section 4.2.24 of the plan.

I object to the hiding of development by "deferment" for sites A24, A25, A26 and A43. I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick's Arch. The potential of an increase at site A43 will be extremely harmful to the rural natures of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause an urban site as buildings abut local boundaries.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8076  Respondent: 15710433 / Simon Hester  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the late inclusion of site A43

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4573  Respondent: 15711265 / Jonathan Dowling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I2). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).
26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>pslp172/1931</th>
<th>Respondent:</th>
<th>15711393 / Kirk Georgiou</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 – My Objections

Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and theA247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends when cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4516  Respondent: 15714817 / Vicky Dowling  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of
four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the
Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will
place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no
certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),
Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to
improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also
mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The
significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to
considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will
have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8169  Respondent: 15717473 / Mark Walles  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8199  Respondent: 15724353 / Arvind Parmar  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 and A43a on Garlick's Arch.

The site was only inserted in the draft plan at a late stage just before publication of the consultation draft which is a shabby way for the Council to proceed. The site is not a sustainable site being far from any infrastructure facilities and transport links. The bus service is infrequent and it is almost certain any future residents will rely almost entirely on cars for journeys. Similarly any employees at the employment areas will almost undoubtedly arrive and leave by car.

The site is susceptible to flooding and will not make a suitable site.

The Green Belt at this point serves the important function of separating West Clandon from Send. Building here will cause the two to coalesce defeating one of the objectives of the Green Belt.

I have seen no evidence that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing this site from the Green Belt or that this important issue has been addressed. The Green Belt and Countryside study did not even consider this site.

It is understood the Council's eyes may have been turned by the possibility of receiving for free the land which might be used for new A3 slip roads in return for allowing this development, thus justifying it as some form of enabling...
development. However the slip road land if needed could be safeguarded in the plan and acquired by compulsory purchase when required. Lack of current funding for the slip road is not a justification for allowing the development of this site. If the slip road is genuinely needed then government funding will be available for it. (One of the reasons for turning down the so called enabling development proposal intended to fund the rebuilding of the Howard of Effingham School was that the redevelopment of the school was not essential. As and when it became essential Government funding would become available. Accordingly enabling development was not necessary. The same principle applies here.)

The A247 running south past this site through the centre of West Clandon is already very heavily used whilst being unsuitable for designation as an A road. In places it is too narrow for two lorries to pass causing them to mount the pavement- often at speed. It has narrow bends with poor sight lines, an infants school and a hump-backed bridge concealing the entrance road to the station for southward traffic. In addition, there are no continuous footpaths which forces pedestrians to cross and re-cross the road. Development at Garlick’s Arch will only exacerbate the problem and make the road even more congested and unsafe for pedestrians.

The development will cause harm to the ancient woodland on and by the site.

Taken together with the Gosden Hill site, there will be a ribbon of development along the A3 in contrast to the current “soft” edge approach to Guildford.

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced with a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land for new on/off ramps at Burnt Common (A43a)
The addition north facing ramps to the A3 at Burnt Common would be a disaster for local communities. There is no requirement for local traffic to access the A3 to the north, but the addition will draw in a huge amount of ‘through’ traffic.

The route from London/M25 to Woking or would now be through Burnt Common and Send. Equally traffic from the east of Guildford (Merrow etc) and the A25 will now go through West Clandon and Burnt Common. This will cause immense damage to those areas on small roads which cannot be improved.

This Plan does not address the needs of local communities or the Borough in this regard. There has again been no Section 18 consultation on this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8202  Respondent: 15724673 / Matthew Bell  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8204  Respondent: 15724801 / Talei Fawcett  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick's Arch is Green Belt and has ancient woodland and has a thriving wildlife habitat, which should be protected. There is no infrastructure, it floods and the the Draft Local Plan Infrastructure schedule does not provide for this site at all.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/8227  Respondent: 15725409 / Nicholas Ward  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43
I OBJECT to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43)

Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

The Plan states the preference is to making the best use of previously developed land. Yet at the 11th hour a perfectly acceptable brown field site at Burnt Common, capable of accommodating approximately 100 houses, was removed from the Plan and replaced with the Garlick’s Arch site. There was no proper consultation in relation to the inclusion of this site. Why was a brownfield site removed and replaced a Greenfield site? There is no evidence that Section 18 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, which requires local planning authorities to produce a Statement of Community Involvement, has been complied with for this site. This only came to light for local residents following a Council meeting on 11th May 2016.

Moreover, Guildford Borough Council’s own Green Belt & Countryside Report does not address Garlick’s Arch at all, so there is no evidence base to support the inclusion of this site.

National Planning Policy promotes sustainable developments, with sustainable transport. With ever reducing bus services in the area and no train station within reasonable walking distance it is impossible for any development on this site to offer a sustainable transport solution. Development on this site is wholly inappropriate (Policy I3).

The stream, which runs through the site, is identified as having a high risk of flooding by the Environment Agency. There are other sites that do not flood that can be developed and therefore this site should be removed from the Plan (Policy P4).

This site is bordered by Ancient Woodland and within it a number of trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders (Policy D3).

The site has an abundance of wildlife, some of which are protected. It is home to many types of owls and bats, with the woods having cuckoos and woodpeckers. In addition there are regular sightings of badgers, deer and red kites. The development of the site will result in the loss of habitat. No wildlife report has been conducted on the site. (Policy I4)

It is clear that with this site being added at the 11th hours no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

Furthermore, several electricity pylon runs through the site, which will have the potential to be a health hazard for any residents.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan.

Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

We object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in Send, Ripley and Clandon will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
We object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay.

Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

We object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

We object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the village of Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

We object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.
We object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

We object to poor air quality (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

We object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
The site is located immediately to the northwest of the A3 (Ripley Bypass), on the southeastern edge of Send Marsh, approximately 2km to the southwest of Ripley and 6km to the northeast of Guildford. The site largely comprises agricultural land, with a relatively small area of commercial land in the centre of the site. High voltage electricity pylons run through the centre of the site across its full length. A substantial tree belt, comprising an element of ancient woodland, screens the northwestern corner of the site, with another patch of woodland located on the southeastern boundary with the A3. A small brook also runs through the eastern portion of the site.

Following previous representations on behalf of the landowners and ongoing engagement with the Council, we welcome the proposed allocation of this site in the draft Local Plan for residential-led development. We set out below our support for the broad strategy and specific elements of the draft Local Plan. We also where appropriate suggest alterations to the proposed policies and supporting text where we consider that these would assist in enhancing the soundness of the Local Plan when adopted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This document sets out our representations on the Guildford Borough Local Plan Proposed Submission Draft on behalf of our client, Ptarmigan Land. Our client controls the land identified within the enclosed Site Location Plan, Site Constraints and Framework Plans which comprises the vast majority of the land identified within the draft allocations set out at Policies A43 and A43a, and is committed to the delivery of this site for residential-led mixed use development in the early years of the plan following its adoption. This site therefore has the potential to make a valuable contribution towards the Borough’s significant development needs, as well as providing additional benefits such as the dedication of the land necessary to deliver the new slip roads onto the A3 detailed in Policy A43a.

Our client welcomes the release of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for residential-led development as detailed within Policy A43, and welcomes the opportunity to work constructively and collaboratively with the Council to shape the emerging proposals for the site, informed by an extensive range of technical assessments and masterplanning work. Our client is also broadly supportive of the Council’s proposed overall development strategy as set out within the current consultation draft of the Local Plan, although as detailed above there are certain aspects which we would encourage the Council to consider further in order to ensure all the proposed policies are fully robust and sound, having regard to the tests set out within paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

We trust the Council will take the above comments into account in the production of the final draft of the plan, and we welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively and constructively with the Council as matters progress. Please do not hesitate to contact Iceni Projects should you wish to discuss matters further.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- 1300 Garlicks Arch Options RevA - Low Res.pdf (4.2 MB)
- Comments Form_Ptarmigan Land.pdf (254 KB)
- 1300 Garlicks Arch Constraints Plan - Low Res.pdf (1.1 MB)
- 160713_Ptarmigan Land_FINAL_merged.pdf (3.4 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7745  Respondent: 15806849 / Ptarmigan Land  Agent: Iceni Projects Ltd (Stuart Mills)

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policies A43 & A43a: Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley, & Land for New North Facing Slip Roads to/from A3 at Send Marsh/Burnt Common

As stated above, the vast majority of the land included within the allocations identified by Policies A43 and A43a is controlled by our client, who is committed to delivering a sustainable residential-led development.
It should be noted that the land required to deliver the slip roads onto the A3 (as identified within Policy A43a) is also controlled by our client, and that they are willing to set aside this land for the purposes of delivering the slip roads in conjunction with the allocation of Site A43 for development as currently proposed within the draft policy. Importantly, the development of Site A43 will not be dependent on the delivery of these slip roads, and indeed is likely to be completed in advance of the slip roads, so as to ensure that the site can provide the maximum possible contribution to the Council’s housing needs within the next five years. The enclosed illustrative Framework drawing demonstrates how the site layout and access can be appropriately designed to accommodate these future slip roads onto the A3, which will be independently delivered, on land controlled by and offered by our client by the relevant authorities. Further details of the slip road design are provided in the Highway Design Note enclosed at Appendix A1.

We strongly support the proposed allocation of the land at Garlick’s Arch for residential-led mixed use development as detailed within Policy A43. The provision of a significant number of new residential dwellings on this available and deliverable site will assist in meeting the Borough’s significant housing needs, and will help to create a ‘critical mass’ of population required to achieve a sustainable mixed community in Send Marsh/ Burnt Common. The site is available for development immediately and can be delivered within the next 5 years, as unlike a number of other allocations in the Local Plan it is (a) solely within the ownership of two parties committed to working together with Ptarmigan Land and (b) not reliant on the provision of additional infrastructure prior to development taking place. The delivery of this allocation shortly after adoption of the Local Plan will therefore assist in meeting housing needs in these crucial early years and minimise the cumulative deficit expected when the housing trajectory is assessed against the annualised requirement. We therefore consider Policy A43 to be positively prepared and therefore sound in accordance with paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it will assist in meeting Guildford’s objectively assessed needs.

The release of this site from the Green Belt, as indicated by the proposed inset boundary on the Proposals Map, is justified by the Council’s evidence base, including the Green Belt and Countryside Study. Volume 2 of the Study assesses the site as only meeting two of the purposes of Green Belt as defined by the NPPF, indicating that the site does not prevent neighbouring settlements from merging and does not preserve the setting and special character of an historic town. Whilst the assessment does consider that the site makes some contribution towards checking the eastward sprawl of the village and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, in our view the A3 (Ripley Bypass) provides a significant long term, logical defensible eastern boundary to Send Marsh/ Burnt Common. Furthermore, the existing areas of trees/ancient woodland, enhanced with further landscaping, as shown on the enclosed plans would perform the function of checking eastward sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment in perpetuity. Accordingly recognisable and enduring new boundaries can be formed to the Green Belt at the southern and eastern edges of the proposed village inset. As such, this site represents a logical and justifiable release from the Green Belt in order to meet the pressing development needs of the Borough established within Draft Policy S2, whilst providing a permanent Green Belt boundary consistent with the guidance contained in Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

We further note that Volume 5 of the Green Belt and Countryside Study finds that potential impacts on the openness of the Green Belt resulting from development at this location could be limited by new tree belts on the site, and that development of this site as a major village expansion would be appropriate as the potential improvements to the sustainability credentials of the village (i.e. contributions towards ensuring the viability of local shops, education, healthcare facilities and services) would outweigh the potential harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. We would also add that as shown on the illustrative masterplan, our client fully intends to remove the high voltage electricity pylons from the site, and re-route the cables underground. The existing pylons represent a significant urbanising feature of the landscape as seen from the existing properties to the north and west, and also in terms of longer distance views from the south on the opposing side of the A3. The presence of the pylons further undermines the existing status of the land as Green Belt, and through the removal of these features and careful planting of landscaping, the outlook from both the A3, and from longer distance views from the south, east and west of the site will be enhanced through the removal of an urbanising feature that encroaches upon the open countryside. We therefore consider the proposed allocation to be entirely justified by the Council’s evidence base and compliant with national policy, and thus is considered sound in accordance with the tests set out at paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

As noted within the Council’s 2016 Land Availability Assessment (LAA), there are no anticipated technical constraints to development of this site, and it is anticipated that it could be acceptably developed for a residential-led mix of uses in a relatively short timeframe following adoption of the Local Plan. The 2016 LAA notes that whilst a small area of the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, the majority is within Flood Zone 1 and therefore not at risk of flooding. Meanwhile appropriate access is expected to be achievable, and there are some existing sustainable transport options
which can be improved. Appropriate mitigation of potential impacts on the Thames Basin Heath SPA can be achieved through contributions towards SANG provision, and as concluded by the Council’s assessment, there is no known reason why well designed new homes and commercial uses in this location should have an unacceptable impact on the environment, existing and future occupiers. The main relevant constraints and opportunities for this site are identified on the enclosed Site Constraints Plan, and the initial masterplan prepared on behalf of our client responds specifically to the identified constraints to demonstrate an appropriate, suitable and viable layout for residential-led development. A full suite of technical assessments will be undertaken in the coming months to inform further detailed masterplanning work and to demonstrate the suitability of the site for the proposed form and scale of development. The results of these assessments will be presented to the Council and the Inspector in due course.

The enclosed illustrative Framework diagram demonstrates how the proposed development of the site can be achieved, having regard to the identified constraints and opportunities. It is anticipated that the main development parcels will be accommodated around the retained woodland and areas of floodplain, which will provide a green corridor throughout the development and serve to limit the potential impact of the proposals on the openness of the Green Belt adjacent to the site. Send Marsh/ Burnt Common does not currently benefit from any significant areas of park/public amenity space and the site has the capacity to accommodate a large area dedicated to sports facilities/ public open space in its centre as a natural focal point and a hub within which our client will explore the potential to provide appropriate services or facilities for the local community. It is anticipated that the broad development parcel within the southwestern corner of the site, closest to the A3 and the new slip roads, would be most appropriate for an element of employment floorspace. The provision of commercial uses in this area, coupled with a landscape bund and acoustic fence will ensure the amenity of future residents is appropriately protected with regard to noise from the A3, whilst also serving to visually screen the site from the road. Appropriate space within the layout will be left to accommodate the future slip roads onto the A3, and the land will be dedicated for this purpose (with actual delivery of the new infrastructure being undertaken by the relevant authorities at a future date, independent of the proposed development on the wider site).

With regard to transport, the Transport Feasibility Appraisal (TFA) provided at Appendix A1 demonstrates that the delivery of a residential led mixed use development accords with the guiding principles of the NPPF; namely:

- The site is well located to encourage people to travel by a variety of modes;
- Safe and suitable access can be provided for all; and,
- The residual impact of the quantum of development envisaged is unlikely to be severe, albeit is accepted that this will need to be considered in further detail over the coming months.

The TFA also sets out how the A3 slip roads could be delivered, together with the outcome of initial feasibility discussions that have been held with highways officers at Highways England, Surrey County Council and Guildford Borough Council. It is worthy to note that the evidence presented within the TFA shows that the area of land that has been safeguarded is sufficient for the relevant authorities to construct the slip road in accordance with current design guidelines, subject to further detailed work being undertaken having regard to the outcome of topographical surveys and detailed traffic modelling. To this end, it is evident that Ptarmigan Land’s intention to safeguard this land will enable Guildford Borough Council to realise a key aspect of its emerging Transport Strategy, and in particular Strategic Road Network Measures 9 and 10.

With regard to the specific requirements of Policy A43, we support the intention for the site to be delivered for predominantly residential uses. The ownership and physical status of the site render it suitable, viable and appropriate to development immediately, providing a substantial contribution to meeting the Borough’s housing needs in the early years of the Local Plan. Indeed, initial masterplanning work has indicated that in excess of 400 new homes could be achieved, and that up to approximately 500 may be deliverable on this site, subject to further detailed technical assessments and masterplanning exercises. Accordingly, whilst as stated above, the intention to provide an element of employment floorspace is supported - in order to deliver employment opportunities for local people and create a sustainable, mixed community that reduces the need to travel, we would welcome greater flexibility in the wording of the policy, allowing for a sliding scale of development that can deliver “up to 7,000 sq. m” of such commercial floorspace, and/or up to 500 new homes (as opposed to 400). We would also encourage the policy wording to allow for additional flexibility in terms of the specific employment generating uses that will be permitted on this site, so as to enable development to respond to local demand and market conditions.
By allowing for ‘up to 7,000 sq. m of commercial floorspace’ on Site Allocation A43 it ensures that any potential reduction in the amount of commercial floorspace as a result of demand, or potential to provide provision elsewhere in the village inset, would not render the policy wording inaccurate or prohibitive to other options. Consequently, by allowing for an upper ceiling of 500 homes, it would provide additional flexibility in this regard to make efficient use of the land, should the final development provide less than 7,000 sqm of commercial floorspace. It is anticipated that development of the site broadly in accordance with the high level illustrative Framework plan enclosed with this submission would be entirely compliant with such amendments to this policy.

The development of this site as set out in Policy A43 will also result in a number of benefits in addition to the provision of residential dwellings and employment floorspace at an early stage of the plan period to help meet the Borough’s development needs. These are anticipated to include the removal of the overhead electricity pylons currently running the length of the site, which are expected to be replaced as part of the development with underground cables. Clearly this will have a significant positive impact, both in terms of the local visual impact and amenity of local residents, and the general impact of the site on the openness of the surrounding Green Belt. Furthermore, the potential provision of local facilities and the contribution towards a ‘critical mass’ within the village will improve the overall sustainability of Send Marsh/ Burnt Common, whilst the provision of land for the new slip roads onto the A3 will facilitate a very substantial benefit to the local community and the wider Borough in terms of the provision of critical infrastructure.

Having regard to the above, we therefore strongly support Policies A43 & A43a, and would welcome the opportunity to work constructively with the Council in the coming months to ensure the prompt development of the site to achieve the Council’s key aims for this allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?


Comment ID: pslp172/3649  Respondent: 15806849 / Ptarmigan Land  Agent: Iceni Projects Ltd (Charlotte Ryan-Elliott)

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Representation on the Local Plan proposed submission draft

3.25 We strongly support the continued intention to allocate the land at Garlick’s Arch within the latest version of the Local Plan for residential-led development. As discussed in our previous representations, the vast majority of the land included within the allocation is controlled by our client, who is committed to delivering a sustainable residential development at this location. Our client is also able to provide the land required to deliver the slip roads onto the A3 as identified within Policy A43a, thereby providing a significant benefit in terms of mitigating the impacts of growth in the area, including at the former Wisley airfield. To this end and in direct response to representations submitted by Highways England to the previous Local Plan consultation, our client is in the process of preparing a Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) with Highways England, Guildford Borough Council and Surrey County Highways Authority.

Employment Uses

3.26 The latest version of Policy A43 as set out in the June 2017 consultation document removes reference to the previously proposed B1(c)/B2/B8 employment uses. The area of land our client identified for delivery of the 7,000 sqm of employment uses previously identified in Policy A43 covered approximately 2 hectares. As such, whilst we have no in-principle objection to the proposed deletion of this use, it is important to find an appropriate alternative use for the 2 hectares to ensure a viable and sustainable development, and to ensure employment needs are appropriately provided for elsewhere as necessary. Accordingly, we maintain that this area of the site is entirely suitable for either a) additional
to provide additional plots within the Plan to accommodate those Travelling Showpeople at Whittles Drive who do not
the short term need, arises from overcrowding and doubling-up on these existing plots, and hence there is a requirement
Assessment indicates that the need identified for additional Travelling Showpeople plots over the plan period, particularly
further two net additional plots at Policy A50 of the draft Local Plan. The Council's 2017 Traveller Accommodation
existing 12 plots in Guildford are located at land at Whittles Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy, which is allocated for a
3.30 With regard to the spatial distribution of accommodation for Travelling Showpeople in the Borough, we note that the
made available by the proposed deletion of employment uses on the land at Garlick's Arch and transferred the
2017 Traveller Accommodation Assessment are met, and it seems likely that the Council has simply identified the land
allocation has seemingly created a requirement to identify additional plots elsewhere to ensure the needs identified in the
residential dwellings, alongside other uses including retail and community facilities. The proposed deletion of this
'land to the south of Normandy and north Flexford' (Policy A46), which was to provide approximately 1,100 new
3.29 As explained within the June 2017 Housing Delivery Topic Paper, the 6 Travelling Showpeople plots identified for
the policy to be unsound and contrary to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it would not be justified.
Travelling Showpeople Plots

3.28 The other principal change to the previous version of the Local Plan published in June 2016 is the proposed
inclusion of a requirement for the provision of 6 plots for Travelling Showpeople. We strongly object to this proposed
amendment to Policy A43. As noted above, requiring this site to include provision for Travelling Showpeople would be
inconsistent with Policy H1, which indicates that sites of 500 homes or more should provide Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation. Clearly, as the site is currently allocated for approximately 400 dwellings, it
does not exceed the 500 dwelling threshold set out in Policy H1 (and would not do so even if the 2 hectares previously
allocated for employment uses are now utilised for housing) and thus there would not appear to be a policy justification
for inclusion of the Travelling Showpeople plots within the allocation. Furthermore, based on the thresholds set out
within Policy H1, a site would not be required to deliver 6 pitches or plots unless 1,500 to 1,999 dwellings were
proposed. Clearly, the scale of development here is significantly below this threshold. We assume that the thresholds in
Policy H1 were devised having regard to a robust evidence base and reasoning regarding the level of Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation that it would be suitable, viable and sustainable to provide alongside a
development comprising general market and affordable housing, and as such it would not appear to be justifiable to
simply ignore these thresholds in this particular case. We are unaware of any justification put forward by the Council as
to why the land at Garlick’s Arch should be an exception in this regard, and we thus consider this proposed amendment to
the policy to be unsound and contrary to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it would not be justified.

3.27 The deletion of the proposed employment element of the allocation set out at Policy A43 releases approximately 2
hectares of land and thus clearly presents a key opportunity to make efficient use of the site to maximise the residential
dwellings that can be accommodated here be that as standard housing provision or for a specialist form of housing such as
a Care Home, thereby assisting to meet the Borough’s very significant housing needs. As noted above in relation to
Policies S2 and H1, it is imperative that relatively unconstrained sites which are capable of delivering a significant
to quantum of residential dwellings within the early years of the Plan following adoption, such as this site, are brought
forward as early as possible, and that their development potential is maximised in order to ensure a sufficient supply of
housing land is identified.

Travelling Showpeople Plots

3.28 The other principal change to the previous version of the Local Plan published in June 2016 is the proposed
inclusion of a requirement for the provision of 6 plots for Travelling Showpeople. We strongly object to this proposed
amendment to Policy A43. As noted above, requiring this site to include provision for Travelling Showpeople would be
inconsistent with Policy H1, which indicates that sites of 500 homes or more should provide Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation. Clearly, as the site is currently allocated for approximately 400 dwellings, it
does not exceed the 500 dwelling threshold set out in Policy H1 (and would not do so even if the 2 hectares previously
allocated for employment uses are now utilised for housing) and thus there would not appear to be a policy justification
for inclusion of the Travelling Showpeople plots within the allocation. Furthermore, based on the thresholds set out
within Policy H1, a site would not be required to deliver 6 pitches or plots unless 1,500 to 1,999 dwellings were
proposed. Clearly, the scale of development here is significantly below this threshold. We assume that the thresholds in
Policy H1 were devised having regard to a robust evidence base and reasoning regarding the level of Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation that it would be suitable, viable and sustainable to provide alongside a
development comprising general market and affordable housing, and as such it would not appear to be justifiable to
simply ignore these thresholds in this particular case. We are unaware of any justification put forward by the Council as
to why the land at Garlick’s Arch should be an exception in this regard, and we thus consider this proposed amendment to
the policy to be unsound and contrary to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it would not be justified.

3.29 As explained within the June 2017 Housing Delivery Topic Paper, the 6 Travelling Showpeople plots identified for
the land at Garlick’s Arch were originally proposed for a much larger allocation in the west of the Borough, known as
‘land to the south of Normandy and north Flexford’ (Policy A46), which was to provide approximately 1,100 new
residential dwellings, alongside other uses including retail and community facilities. The proposed deletion of this
allocation has seemingly created a requirement to identify additional plots elsewhere to ensure the needs identified in the
2017 Traveller Accommodation Assessment are met, and it seems likely that the Council has simply identified the land
made available by the proposed deletion of employment uses on the land at Garlick’s Arch and transferred the
outstanding 6 plots onto this site, without any further detailed assessment of justification.

3.30 With regard to the spatial distribution of accommodation for Travelling Showpeople in the Borough, we note that the
existing 12 plots in Guildford are located at land at Whittles Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy, which is allocated for a
further two net additional plots at Policy A50 of the draft Local Plan. The Council’s 2017 Traveller Accommodation
Assessment indicates that the need identified for additional Travelling Showpeople plots over the plan period, particularly
the short term need, arises from overcrowding and doubling-up on these existing plots, and hence there is a requirement
to provide additional plots within the Plan to accommodate those Travelling Showpeople at Whittles Drive who do not

housing; b) an alternative appropriate compatible use such as a Care Home; or c) an element of employment (B1(c)/B2/
B8) uses if required. Whilst paragraph 4.151 of the Council’s June 2017 Housing Delivery Topic Paper suggests that the
employment element of the allocation has been deleted in response to some concerns raised that the employment uses
may not be compatible with residential dwellings, we are not aware of any evidence which would substantiate such
concerns. Clearly, there are innumerable examples of where industrial/commercial uses have been successfully
accommodated within relatively close proximity to residential dwellings, and with appropriate masterplanning and
mitigation measures where necessary we are not aware of any technical reasons as to why an element of employment uses
could not be accommodated on this site if required. Notwithstanding this, we note that employment uses are now
proposed at the site known as ‘land around Burnt Common warehouse, London Road, Send’ (Policy A58) instead, and
provided employment needs are appropriately met elsewhere we have no objection to the principle of deleting the
proposed employment use for the land at Garlick’s Arch, provided the land which was allocated for employment uses is
appropriately utilised for either additional residential development, or an appropriate alternative use such as a Care Home
instead.

Travelling Showpeople Plots

3.28 The other principal change to the previous version of the Local Plan published in June 2016 is the proposed
inclusion of a requirement for the provision of 6 plots for Travelling Showpeople. We strongly object to this proposed
amendment to Policy A43. As noted above, requiring this site to include provision for Travelling Showpeople would be
inconsistent with Policy H1, which indicates that sites of 500 homes or more should provide Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation. Clearly, as the site is currently allocated for approximately 400 dwellings, it
does not exceed the 500 dwelling threshold set out in Policy H1 (and would not do so even if the 2 hectares previously
allocated for employment uses are now utilised for housing) and thus there would not appear to be a policy justification
for inclusion of the Travelling Showpeople plots within the allocation. Furthermore, based on the thresholds set out
within Policy H1, a site would not be required to deliver 6 pitches or plots unless 1,500 to 1,999 dwellings were
proposed. Clearly, the scale of development here is significantly below this threshold. We assume that the thresholds in
Policy H1 were devised having regard to a robust evidence base and reasoning regarding the level of Gypsy & Traveller or
Travelling Showpeople accommodation that it would be suitable, viable and sustainable to provide alongside a
development comprising general market and affordable housing, and as such it would not appear to be justifiable to
simply ignore these thresholds in this particular case. We are unaware of any justification put forward by the Council as
to why the land at Garlick’s Arch should be an exception in this regard, and we thus consider this proposed amendment to
the policy to be unsound and contrary to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it would not be justified.

3.29 As explained within the June 2017 Housing Delivery Topic Paper, the 6 Travelling Showpeople plots identified for
the land at Garlick’s Arch were originally proposed for a much larger allocation in the west of the Borough, known as
‘land to the south of Normandy and north Flexford’ (Policy A46), which was to provide approximately 1,100 new
residential dwellings, alongside other uses including retail and community facilities. The proposed deletion of this
allocation has seemingly created a requirement to identify additional plots elsewhere to ensure the needs identified in the
2017 Traveller Accommodation Assessment are met, and it seems likely that the Council has simply identified the land
made available by the proposed deletion of employment uses on the land at Garlick’s Arch and transferred the
outstanding 6 plots onto this site, without any further detailed assessment of justification.

3.30 With regard to the spatial distribution of accommodation for Travelling Showpeople in the Borough, we note that the
existing 12 plots in Guildford are located at land at Whittles Drive, Aldershot Road, Normandy, which is allocated for a
further two net additional plots at Policy A50 of the draft Local Plan. The Council’s 2017 Traveller Accommodation
Assessment indicates that the need identified for additional Travelling Showpeople plots over the plan period, particularly
the short term need, arises from overcrowding and doubling-up on these existing plots, and hence there is a requirement
to provide additional plots within the Plan to accommodate those Travelling Showpeople at Whittles Drive who do not
Currently, it would therefore be logical and sustainable to accommodate this need as close as possible to the existing Travelling Showpeople plots, given the likely associations between the families wishing to secure their own plot and those remaining at Whittles Drive. However, the Council has not adequately demonstrated a need for such plots.

3.31 Furthermore, it is unclear whether the existing families at Whittles Drive that are in need of their own plots would actually utilise the new plots in Send Marsh/Burnt Common, given the significant distance between them and uncertainty regarding whether they would be suitable for these particular Travellers. Given the lack of evidence as to whether these proposed new plots would be suitable in this regard, it cannot be concluded that this element of the policy has been positively prepared as required by paragraph 182 of the NPPF. Consequently, we consider that the proposed amendment of Policy A43 to include provision for Travelling Showpeople plots is unsound, as there is no evidence that this will actually meet the identified need for such plots.

3.32 Having reviewed the Council’s evidence base documents, it would appear that no specific assessment has been undertaken regarding the suitability of the land at Garlick’s Arch for the provision of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots, and that the plots appear to have simply been transferred from the now deleted site A46 once it had been decided that the employment floorspace previously identified for the land at Garlick’s Arch was to be relocated at site A58. The June 2017 Sustainability Appraisal Update suggests (at Table 10.1) that the land at Garlick’s Arch was identified as an alternative site for the 6 pitches originally allocated for the land to the South or Normandy and north of Flexford on the basis that “[t]here is no available alternative site that can provide Travelling Showpeople plots in the first five years of the plan to meet need”. It is assumed that the reference to the first five years of the plan is actually intended to refer to the first five years following adoption of the plan. Regardless, this commentary would appear to provide the only explanation as to why the Council is now proposing a requirement for 6 Travelling Showpeople plots as part of the development of the land at Garlick’s Arch. However, the Sustainability Appraisal does not provide any further evidence as to why other sites could not accommodate this need within the first five years following adoption of the plan, and as such we consider this proposed amendment to Policy A43 to be unsound, as it is not justified having regard to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

3.33 In order to facilitate a comparison between the strategic sites identified as being suitable for delivery of a portion of Gypsy & Traveller/Travelling Showpeople accommodation and to demonstrate how the requirements of Policy H1 are intended to be met, we set out in Appendix 1 a table identifying all sites proposed for residential-led development that exceed the 500 dwelling threshold identified within Policy S2, as well as the land at Garlick’s Arch in light of its proposed allocation for 6 Travelling Showpeople plots. It should be noted that those sites allocated solely for Gypsy & Traveller pitches or Travelling Showpeople plots, which will deliver the remainder of the requirement, are not included for the purposes of this comparison. The table highlights that site A29 (‘land to the south and east of Ash and Tongham’) is not currently allocated for any Gypsy & Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation, despite being of a sufficient size to require the provision of 6 pitches or plots. It is unclear why no provision is made for Gypsy & Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation on this site. We understand that planning permission has been granted for development of part of the site already, however, the Council has not provided any evidence as to why provision for Travellers could not be made as part of the remainder of the allocation. Based on the trajectory included within the 2017 Addendum to the Land Availability Assessment, the Ash and Tongham urban extension is expected to deliver residential dwellings immediately following adoption of the Local Plan, and thus provides an opportunity for early delivery of Gypsy & Traveller pitches or Travelling Showpeople plots. As such, the Council has not adequately demonstrated a need to provide Gypsy & Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots on sites under 500 dwellings in order to meet identified needs (in addition to those provided on smaller sites identified for solely for Travellers).

3.34 As discussed above, even if the Council were to consider it necessary to identify sites below the 500 unit threshold in order to meet the identified needs, this would be contrary to the approach identified within Policy H1, and as such this policy would require amending. Any such amendments would need to be justified by the appropriate evidence to demonstrate that delivery of Gypsy & Traveller pitches or Travelling Showpeople plots on sites comprising less than 500 dwellings would be suitable, sustainable and viable.
3.35 Having regard to the above, if additional land is still required to accommodate Gypsy & Traveller/ Travelling Showpeople needs and this cannot be delivered as part of residential-led developments in accordance with the requirements of Policy H1, it may be necessary for the Council to identify additional small sites dedicated solely to Gypsy & Traveller pitches/ Travelling Showpeople plots. We would therefore encourage the Council to undertake a full assessment of potential sites in order to identify any additional capacity in this way if necessary.

3.36 On the basis of the above points, we strongly object to the proposed amendment to Policy A43 to require 6 Travelling Showpeople plots to be provided as part of the residential development of the site. In our assessment, the proposed amendment would be unsound, having regard to the requirements of paragraph 182 of the NPPF, as it would not be justified, positively prepared or effective. A requirement for 6 plots on site A43 would fundamentally contradict the Council’s own policy as set out at Policy H1, and it has not been demonstrated that the provision of Travelling Showpeople plots in this location would actually serve the identified need. Meanwhile the Council has not provided sufficient evidence or justification as to why it would be acceptable in principle to require a site of this size to accommodate Gypsy & Traveller/ Travelling Showpeople accommodation, or why this site in particular would be suitable for such provision (or indeed why this site would be the only/ most suitable site to accommodate any outstanding need).

3.37 In order to make the policy sound, we therefore consider that the proposed amendment relating to the provision of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots should be deleted. Should the land originally proposed for employment floorspace on this site no longer be required, we consider that it would be appropriate to increase the proposed quantum of residential development in order to ensure the development of this site, and the contribution it makes towards the supply of housing in the Borough, is maximised. The enclosed vision document indicates that up to approximately 500 dwellings could be appropriately accommodated on the site, or that provision could be made for an alternative appropriate use such as a care home in addition to the 400 homes having regard to the technical and masterplanning work undertaken to date. We therefore request that the Council update the wording of the policy to reflect this potential capacity and ensure that it does not artificially constrain the future development of this site and its potential contribution to the Borough’s housing supply.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents: Appendix 1.pdf (193 KB)
village negating any further future expansion into the Green Belt to the south-east. A planted landscape buffer, potentially including a bund and acoustic fence, serves to mitigate any noise generated by the A11.

The plan (left) summarises the key considerations. The following pages describe these in more detail. Full technical reports include:

- Transport and Access
- Utilities
- Air Quality
- Arboriculture Survey
- Archaeology
- Noise

Transport and Access

The NPPF is predicated on the assumption that new developments are located in areas that provide people with a choice of travel modes and are able to provide safe and suitable access for all. There is also a presumption that new developments should only be resisted on highways and transportation grounds when it can be demonstrated it will lead to a severe impact upon the local transport networks.

When considered against this background it is evident that the allocation of the Land at Garlick’s Arch is well placed to accord with these principles. An overview of the benefits associated with the development at the Site is provided below, with a more detailed assessment provided in the Technical Appendices.

Opportunities to walk and cycle

The Land at Garlick’s Arch is well connected to an existing network of pedestrian and cycle routes that have the potential to encourage future residents to make use of these important modes of transport. However, there are currently gaps in the existing infrastructure that may limit existing residents in Send Marsh from using these modes and/or accessing the new community facilities that will be provided at the Land at Garlick’s Arch. For example, there are not any pedestrian crossing points provided between the residential areas to the north of Portsmouth Road and the bus stops that are located adjacent to the Site.

Development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch therefore offers the potential to address these limitations for the benefit of existing and future populations alike. This is likely to include new footways along Portsmouth Road and the introduction of formal pedestrian crossings.

Opportunities to travel by public transport

The local pedestrian network provides excellent connectivity to the local bus network with the closest bus stops located adjacent to the Portsmouth Road/Burnt Common Lane junction. The bus services that operate from these bus stops follow routes that incorporate key local employment and retail centres. It is possible to undertake longer journeys by a combined busrail trip as the bus services that operate along Portsmouth Road also access Clandon railway station.

To ensure good access to public transport to and from the Site, pedestrian links to the existing bus stops on Portsmouth Road will be provided. These can be supplemented by the creation of new bus stops within the Site. The delivery of the latter will be dependent upon the outcome of discussions with local bus operators, but, subject to further detailed review and agreement with the existing operators, it is considered viable to divert either of the existing routes that serve the site without having a significant impact upon their current timetables. The additional patronage as a result of the new residents will be an additional benefit to the viability of the services.

Access to the highway network

The local highway network is focused around Portsmouth Road, which provides a connection to Guildford town centre to the west and Junction 10 of the M25 Motorway to the east via the A3. As part of the Strategic Highway Network, the A3 also links the Site with Portsmouth and the M3 Motorway (via the A31) to the south west. It is therefore evident that the Site is well located with respect to key local centres and the wider region.
However, the A3 does not currently benefit from a junction that caters for all movements. To this end, existing residents of Send Marsh, Burntcommon and the wider area are required to travel relatively long distances to access the A3. This places sensitive areas of the local highway network, including Ripley village centre, under stress.

Development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to address this as Ptarmigan Land is willing to facilitate the safeguarding of land for new ‘on’ and ‘off-slips’ to the A3, which forms a key part of GBC’s emerging Transport Strategy that is being developed to assist with the delivery of the housing and employment requirements of the emerging Local Plan.

Notwithstanding this, an initial highway impact assessment has established that increases in traffic associated with a large scale mixed-use development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch are unlikely to materially affect the operation of the local highway network without the new A3 slip roads in place. It has also been shown that the emerging access strategy for the site will provide a safe and suitable means of access in accordance with the NPPF.

Access to local services

The Land at Garlick’s Arch is relatively well located to a range of facilities and services that can be accessed by walking, cycling and public transport in accordance with the guiding principles of the NPPF. However, it is understood that Send Marsh and Burntcommon have previously received a poor rating from GBC for their access to community facilities.

From a transportation perspective it is considered that a major mixed use development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch will provide a quantum and mix of development that can deliver a step change in the availability of local services. For example, the inclusion of a local centre, new village green and SANG will significantly increase the offer that is available to existing residents thereby reducing the length and frequency of journeys.

Utilities

Data on the location of existing utilities in and around the site has been obtained from the statutory undertakers and this demonstrates that there are no significant constraints to delivery of the Site.

It is proposed that pylons that pass through the site will be under-grounded to improve visual amenity.

Air Quality

We have completed an initial High Level Review of the Air Quality Issues.

A review of current information has indicated that air quality at the Site is likely to be characterised as having low to moderate concentrations of background pollutants exacerbated by contributions from the local road network, principally the A3 Ripley bypass to the south of the Site with current traffic flows exceeding 90,000 vehicles per day. As a result placement of residential units immediately adjacent to this road within the Site will need to be carefully considered.

Given the range of mitigation options available, as detailed in the accompanying reports, and the relatively low concentration of urban background pollutants in this area away from the A3, it is not considered likely that air quality will present a constraint to the granting of outline planning permission for the residential development of this Site.

Archaeology

A desk-based archaeology and heritage assessment has been completed for the Site. The Surrey Historic Environment Record and History Centre have been consulted as have Historic England’s Archive and National Heritage List for England. These and online sources informed a site walkover. No designated heritage assets lie close to the Site and given topography and existing development and vegetation, no designated heritage assets would be adversely affected by development of the Site. Although the general pattern of the landscape is recognisable on 18th century maps, early field boundaries have been removed except on the edges of some woodland where wood banks survive. The only structure on the Site is a large late twentieth century metal and breeze-block building with no special architectural or historical interest. ‘Garlick’s Arch’ itself is a culvert under the road marking the western boundary of the site and this appears to have been replaced in modern times.
There is nothing archaeological recorded for the Site and limited evidence in the area. The land may only have been brought into agricultural use in recent centuries and medieval settlement is likely to have been dispersed and to have lain away from the Site. The construction of the A3 radically redefined the landscape post-war. Past and continuing cultivation and tree roots will have truncated any sub-surface remains which do lie within the Site.

The Site has low archaeological potential. Although sub-surface remain may lie within the Site area, it is almost certain that they would be typical, locally significant features which could be dealt with through further investigation ahead of construction and would not constrain scheme design.

**Noise**

A noise impact assessment has been prepared to test the site’s suitability for residential development. The assessment has been based on detailed environmental noise measurements and predicted noise levels at the site, under open site conditions.

The noise predictions have been carried using the noise-modelling suite Cadna/A, in accordance with the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) prediction methodologies, based on noise measurements taken at the site.

The assessment has been utilised to develop a masterplan for the site; the built form of which will add significant screening and reduce the effects of noise within the interior of the site.

In light of the findings of this assessment, it is considered with appropriate, acoustically sympathetic design that the site can be feasibly developed for residential purposes, while complying with all relevant British Standards and that noise should not present a constraint to the granting of outline planning permission for the residential development of this site.

**Landscape Assessment**

The text below summarises the findings of the Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Review which accompanies the Vision Document.

The Site is not of noteworthy scenic beauty, and does not contain any landscape features of any particular importance with the exception of the TPO group in the north-eastern part of the Site, and does not afford the opportunity for public outdoor recreation due to the lack of access. It is not within the Surrey Hills AONB.

The Site is well contained and largely screened from view from its surrounding context, with the exception of glimpsed views from the A3 adjoining the south-eastern boundary of the Site and long distance glimpsed views from elevated land to the south. This is due to a combination of topography and the strong vegetation structure present locally within the settlements and wider landscape, including the field boundaries and numerous woodland blocks present locally.

The assessment within the Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Review identifies that the contribution that the Site makes to the purposes of Green Belt is limited. The Council’s own assessment also supports this view.

In conclusion, development could be effectively assimilated within the Site from a landscape and visual perspective and would not compromise the purposes and function of the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposed masterplan improves local visual amenity by relocating visually unattractive pylons and power cables underground for the benefit of the entire village.

On this basis, the Site is considered appropriate for release from the Green Belt for residential development.

6 Vision

*The vision for Garlick’s Arch is dual themed.*

**Liveability: A Good Neighbour**

Whilst an important theme is creating a considered, well designed and aspirational approach to site planning, the Land at Garlick’s Arch also seeks to add real benefit to the existing community by enhancing daily village life.
**Theme One: Enhance Village Facilities Burntcommon Today**

The Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an opportunity to enhance Send Marsh/Burntcommon as a liveable and sustainable village by providing those facilities and amenities you would expect to find in a settlement of a similar size.

Today the village is predominantly comprised of the built-up residential estates of Boughton Court Avenue and the Portsmouth Road forming Burntcommon. As identified in earlier chapters of this document, local facilities extend to a petrol filling station and a Little Waitrose with little else to meet the daily needs of villagers. There is a notable lack of public open space with the village lacking a park, sports pitches and allotments. Community space for social events is also absent.

The Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an opportunity to provide real benefit to the village through the provision of new facilities as part of a ‘community heart’.

**Theme Two: Site Vision**

The need for bespoke design solutions across the Land at Garlick’s Arch

The Site is divided into southern-northern parts by a stream and mature vegetation. The southern portion of the Site is a large, relatively flat, and irregular shaped field set against the urban context of the existing village edge and A3. The northern portion of the Site is more contained by mature woodland and also comprises a grazed field hillock and two further contained parcels of land.

A bespoke north and south design response

The differing southern and northern site conditions prompt the need for a bespoke design solution to each area. When this design solution is combined with analysis of what placemaking elements would enhance the village, undertaken in earlier sections of this document, a clear rationale for the Site’s organisation takes shape. Conceptually this is best described by the Venn diagram above. The ‘Village’ and ‘Infrastructure’ elements respond to the context of the southern, more urbanised, portion of the Site. The ‘Arcadia’ element responds to the landscape assets of the northern area of the Site.

The character of the ‘Village’, ‘Infrastructure’ and ‘Arcadia’ elements are outlined in the following pages of this document. Where the elements meet a new village heart complete with a village green, convenience shopping and community space is created.

**Development Principles**

The following sequence of diagrams show the key principles for the development of the Land at Garlick’s Arch.

The Site today

The Site, which covers a total area of circa 30 hectares, is surrounded by mature vegetation belts which provide physical and visual containment to much of the Site, particularly from the north and east.

Pylons extend across the Site, and a telecommunications mast is visible to the south of the Site, which in combination with the adjoining settlement edge of Send Marsh / Burntcommon and the presence of the A3 corridor, exert an urbanising influence on the Site.

The Site is divided into a southern and a northern part by a stream corridor and associated mature vegetation. The Site and wider landscape comprises parcels of woodland, some of which is ancient woodland.

1. Completion of the south eastern extent of the village

Development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch is enclosed by defensible boundaries of neighbouring built areas and the A3. Development at this location provides a logical development parcel in the completion of the village and does not open up the possibility of coalescence or further encroachment in to the Green Belt.
2. Improve Visual Amenity

The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to improve local visual amenity by relocating pylons and power cables underground for the benefit of the entire village.

3. Maintain and enhance visual enclosure and create an acoustic bund to mitigate noise generated by the A3

Retain and enhance natural features including hedgerows, trees and water bodies for the benefit of flora and fauna. The retention of trees and hedgerows provides mature planting with aesthetic value that helps to mitigate the visual impact of future development.

Opportunity to create a tree planted landscape bund to reduce the noise generated by the A3.

4. Create A Woodland Park

Create a woodland park to recognise the value of the existing ancient woodland and stream. The woodland landscape corridors provide new public open space for existing and new residents and are conduits for pedestrian and cycling movement. The landscape corridors link the Garlick’s Arch community to the village and surrounding countryside.

The woodland park provides an attractive outlook for new homes.

5. Mitigate Long Distance Views

Create planted screens and a hillock pocket park to mitigate the potential for external longer distance views.

6. Create a Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy

The existing topography and proposed landscape corridors provide an opportunity to create a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS) of swales and ponds to mitigate surface water. The creation of a SUDS network provides the opportunity for semi-wetland habitats to enhance biodiversity. Swales and ponds also provide a place for people to enjoy nature and relax.

7. Establish ‘Arcadia’

Create a sensitive, lower density, Arcadian approach to development in an area of the site with a wealth of valuable natural features including woodland and a stream.

Please see the following page for more information on Arcadia.

7. Establish 'Arcadia'

Introduction

The topography and mature planted landscape encircling the northern part of the Site offers the opportunity to create a unique character through a sensitive, landscape-led design approach. Long distance views into this part of the Site call for a proposal where rooftops blend within clusters of trees rather than dominating the skyline.

An Arcadian approach to development differs from more standard development models by creating pedestrian scaled environments through trees, hedges and shrubs rather than buildings. This allows a greater proportion of buildings to be free standing or clustered in smaller groups rather than space enclosing elements within a wider landscape. This provides a legitimate context for detached and semi-detached clusters of homes which are nestled amongst a dominant landscape.

Arcadia is the creation of the rural idyll by using the picturesque approach to landscape design as typified by the layout of parks of great country houses in the eighteenth century. These landscapes were pioneered by Capability Brown, ‘England’s greatest gardener’, whose approach to landscape was more organic and naturalistic.
A key ingredient of Arcadia is the use of meandering walks and lanes which successively reveal features interspersed within a dominant landscape. In the same way, early 'leafy' suburbs of the nineteenth and early twentieth century conceal houses among mature trees so that the visitor is more aware of the landscape setting than of the houses.

Arcadia at Garlick’s Arch should strive for the same effect.

Key ingredients of Arcadia:

- a dominant, naturalistic, landscape
- existing tree cover enhanced by new planting
- front gardens enclosed by hedges in order for the landscape to dominate the houses.
- avoidance of built enclosures such as walls and gates
- detached and semi-detached homes
- a meandering network of paths and lanes
- a sequence of green open spaces
- human-scale enclosure provided by landscape features rather than buildings
- natural materials and colour
- generous, planted, front gardens with buildings set back

8. Provide sports pitches for the benefit of new and existing residents

The local area lacks sports provision and a village green. New sports pitches benefit both existing and new residents. The creation of a village green encourages social cohesion and reflects the local settlement pattern of village greens at Send Marsh, Send and Ripley.

9. Extend the ‘Village’

Please see the following page for information on Extend the Village.

Introduction

The ‘Village’ is an a modern interpretation of the traditional village character found in surrounding historic villages such as Ripley and immediately around Send Manor in Send Marsh.

Key components of the village character include:

- Enclosure created by continuity of built front
- High proportion of dwellings joined to one another in flats, terraces and semidetached arrangement. Individuality of buildings should be encouraged as found in historic towns and villages where individual buildings happen to be joined to one another
- Breaks between buildings for car parking or access to read car parking areas should be bridged over at first floor level
- Buildings on corners to address dual street frontage through openings
- Shallow front gardens to encourage spatial enclosure
- Traditional materials deployed in a contemporary architectural language

Infrastructure Benefits

The Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an ideal opportunity to provide a sustainable, residential led development whilst enhancing the existing settlement’s infrastructure, providing additional benefits to the local community.

Local infrastructure will be improved through the provision of new vehicular linkages through the site, making land available for the creation of new slip roads onto the A3 and improving visual amenity by relocating pylons underground.

10. Relieving Traffic Pressure at the Send Barns Lane & Clandon/London/Portsmouth Road Roundabout Junction
Relieve traffic pressure at the Send Barns Lane & Clandon/London/Portsmouth Road Roundabout Junction by encouraging traffic through the Garlick’s Arch site between Portsmouth Road and the A3.

11. Enable the Delivery of A3 Slip Roads & Junction Improvements

Enable the delivery of new access slip roads and junctions improvements to the A3.

The site is capable of being delivered entirely independently of the proposed slip roads.

12. Provide a New Village Park & Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG)

In accordance with Natural England guidelines, a large area of natural greenspace will be provided for the benefit of local residents. At present, neither the Site or the area where SANG is proposed benefits from public access. A potential location for the provision of this SANG has been identified immediately to the south of the Land at Garlick’s Arch, within easy walking distance of Burntcommon. This would provide immediate positives to the existing and proposed residents in terms of access to local walks, greenspaces, a village green and sports facilities on the Sang and the Site itself which is not currently available. Alternatively, an appropriate contribution can be made towards the funding a nearby SANG already approved by the Council and Natural England.

Introduction

The Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) will be delivered as part of a planning application for the proposed development of Garlick’s Arch, Send. A SANG Management Plan has been produced to accompany a future planning application and provides further information as to how the SANG will be used and managed.

The SANG is proposed as part of the mitigation package designed to ensure there are no adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBH SPA).

The scheme’s required SANG provision will be 8ha and the site can provide 16ha.

The overall site consists of an area of pastoral farmland and Ancient Woodland, located within private land. The site includes boundary trees and hedgerows, and internal hedgerows with trees. The site is bordered to the south by Tithebarns Lane, to the west by Tithebarns and to the north by the A3 and the east by further farmland. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the site was carried out in September 2016. The arable land is of limited ecological value, although the fields are bounded by native hedgerows which offer some value to wildlife. The hedgerows and associated boundaries have potential for protected species including nesting birds, reptiles and hazel dormice.

The SANG has been designed in accordance with Natural England’s guidance and has involved correspondence and a site meeting with Natural England. The proposed SANG is closely linked to the proposed housing development and is thus intended for local use, plus has car park provision for the additional capacity for other housing developments.

13. Create a Mixed-Use Neighbourhood Heart

Introduction

The meeting of ‘Arcadia’, ‘Village’ and the ‘Infrastructure’ elements of the Site present an opportunity to create a neighbourhood heart for Burntcommon. The heart is a community focal point and includes a village green, convenience shopping and community space to support daily needs.

Village greens are a key component of the local village settlement pattern. This character extends the nearby villages of Send Marsh, Send and Ripley (see right). As identified in earlier chapters of this document, Burntcommon lacks a discernible village heart. The Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an opportunity to create a community focal point for Burntcommon through the creation of a village heart for the benefit of new and existing residents.

Vision
The Land at Garlick’s Arch adds real benefit to the existing community of Burntcommon by enhancing daily village life through the provision of a new community heart that includes a village green, convenience shopping and community space to support daily needs.

The Land at Garlick’s Arch enables the delivery of A3 slip roads & junction improvements. However, the Site is deliverable regardless of whether the slip roads are constructed. The two options showing the vision with and without the slips roads are shown pages 43 and 44.

**The Numbers**

The Vision support the emerging Local Plan policy by providing for approximately 400 homes.

**Community Engagement**

Community Engagement is integral to developing the vision for the Land at Garlick’s Arch. Ptarmigan Land has a strong track record in working with local residents, community groups and business groups, as well as locally elected representatives, at each stage of developing their proposals. We firmly believe that successful developments are those where the interests of stakeholders are given full consideration, and where a transparent, proactive engagement strategy is adopted.

This is true for the Land at Garlick’s Arch, where Ptarmigan Land will work closely with local ward members, Send and Ripley Parish Councils, as well as community action groups, to ensure that interested parties are kept up-to-date with the development of the proposals and have the opportunity to help shape them. The wider community will also be invited to take a proactive role in shaping the proposals, through a variety of tailored engagement events.

Engagement activities will be designed to be both appropriate for the stakeholders’ interest, and for the stage of the development of the proposals; allowing for meaningful engagement from the concept stage through to detailed design.

It is envisaged that engagement activities will include:

- One-to-one stakeholder meetings;
- Design-led workshops;
- Public drop-in exhibition events;
- Community update newsletters; and
- A community consultation website.

Early, regular engagement generating effective dialogue will help shape the vision for Garlick’s Arch. This will allow for a scheme that meets the needs of the local community, whilst maximising the opportunity of the site to provide for a sustainable community, and benefits for existing and new residents.

**7 Conclusions**

*This document has been prepared on behalf of Ptarmigan Land in relation to Land at Garlick’s Arch in order to set out a vision for development of the Site for residential-led purposes.*

The Site has been identified in the Submission Draft (June 2016) of the Local Plan to be released from the Green Belt consistent with draft allocation A43 of the Local Plan. The identified Site would also make land available for the provision of new slip roads onto the A3, in accordance with Policy A43a of the Submission Draft of the Local Plan.

The Site provides a significant opportunity to create a sustainable community by knitting together the existing ‘ad-hoc’ areas of the village with a new heart and community that is inherently more sustainable. It will help to meet local housing needs. As set out above, the Site is well located having regard to existing residential development in the area and the proximity of existing facilities, and is relatively unconstrained with regard to technical matters such as transport and access, utilities, air quality, noise, ecology and heritage. Development of this Site would not have an unduly detrimental impact on the landscape character of the wider countryside or adjacent Green Belt, and comprises a currently underutilised area to which the public have no access, between existing development on three sides and the A3 on the
fourth. Furthermore, the proposed masterplan improves local visual amenity by relocating visually unattractive pylons and power cables underground for the benefit of the entire village.

On this basis, the Site is considered appropriate for release from the Green Belt for residential development. This Site therefore represents a logical opportunity to enhance the character of Send Marsh/ Burntcommon and provide additional homes and local facilities within the settlement, and to provide a more logical and clearly defined southern boundary to the village and the wider Green Belt.

The vision for the Site includes a number of interlocking elements which will create a sustainable, mixed community which will enhance the existing settlement and provide a number of wider benefits. These elements include the provision of a logical, defined edge to the settlement, an improvement to visual amenity, the creation of a pleasant, liveable environment including a woodland park and sustainable drainage measures, and the establishment of ‘arcadia’. New homes and jobs will be provided around a thoughtfully designed heart of the community, incorporating sports pitches and creating the opportunity to provide other facilities such as a village shop of community hall. Local infrastructure will be improved through the provision of new vehicular linkages through the site, and making land available for the creation of new slip roads onto the A3.

Having regard to the various considerations discussed within this document, the Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an ideal opportunity to provide a sustainable, residential-led mixed use development which will assist in meeting Guildford Borough’s housing needs whilst enhancing the existing settlement and providing additional benefits to the local community. Ptarmigan Land look forward to engaging further with Guildford Borough Council, consultees and local stakeholders in order to realise this vision in the coming months and years.

[For full comment, see previous comment's attatments]

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3724</th>
<th>Respondent: 15806849 / Ptarmigan Land</th>
<th>Agent: Iceni Projects Ltd (Charlotte Ryan-Elliott)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong></td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; comply with the Duty to Cooperate? ( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Sound? ( )</strong></td>
<td><strong>is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Site provides a significant opportunity to create a more sustainable community at Burntcommon whilst helping to meet local housing needs. The Site is located near to existing facilities within Send Marsh and key centres across the Borough more widely. As detailed in the technical appendices to this document, the Site is relatively unconstrained with regard to considerations such as transport and access, utilities, air quality, noise, ecology and heritage. Furthermore, the Site is well contained within the landscape and could be developed without having an unduly detrimental impact on the wider countryside. By infilling this vacant area of land between the existing residential development to the north and west and the A3 dual carriageway to the southeast, this Site will provide a more logical and clearly defined southern boundary to the village.

There are a number of potential benefits associated with development of the Site. In addition to the provision of a broad range of much-needed family housing that will assist in meeting the Borough’s acute needs, this residential-led development has the potential to provide community facilities/ infrastructure to create a more defined and sustainable ‘centre’ to Burntcommon. This will strengthen the sense of place and identity of the area, whilst providing the necessary ‘critical mass’ of population to support the viability of local facilities such as a village shop thereby creating a more sustainable community. Highways improvements associated with the development offer the potential to relieve traffic through Send Marsh and Ripley, and the proposed removal of the high voltage electricity pylons running through the Site would significantly enhance the visual appearance of the Site and wider area. Further benefits of developing the Site are discussed throughout this document.
This Vision Document also identifies the key considerations that will need to be taken into account as the emerging proposals for the Site progress. These include the provision of appropriate mitigation measures to account for noise and air quality, which have been fully investigated and accounted for in the design and layout of the development. An assessment of the potential impact on the surrounding landscape has also been undertaken to inform the location, design and density of the proposed uses. Highways and access will also be an important consideration; the Site is relatively well served by road, walking and cycling connections and public transport, and opportunities will be taken where appropriate to enhance local connectivity.

Having regard to the various considerations discussed within this document, the Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an ideal opportunity to provide a sustainable, residential-led mixed use development which will assist in meeting Guildford Borough’s housing needs whilst enhancing the existing settlement. The Site is suitably located and relatively unconstrained, and as acknowledged by the Council through the emerging Local Plan, would comprise a logical amendment to the historic Green Belt boundary in order to facilitate development and establish a robustly justified, long term, recognisable and defensible boundary to Burntcommon.

Set out on page 5 is an overview of the Site and its surroundings, followed by a summary of the latest planning policy position relating to this proposed allocation. Chapter 3 of this document identifies a number of the key benefits associated with the emerging proposals, whilst Chapter 4 considers the sustainability of development in this particular location. Chapter 5 provides an analysis of the key considerations which have been taken into account in the design of the Site. Further details regarding the vision for this Site – in particular how it could appear, contribute to and function as part of the wider settlement are provided in Chapter 6. This chapter, which brings together the various elements of the proposed vision into a high level illustrative masterplan. This illustrates how the Site might be comprehensively developed to provide a new sustainable community. Conclusions regarding the Site and the vision for its development are set out in Chapter 7.

About The Site

The Site, which covers a total area of circa 30 hectares, is located to the south of the B2215 (Portsmouth Road) approximately 6.5 kilometres to the north east of Guildford town centre within the administrative boundaries of Guildford Borough Council (GBC) and Surrey County Council (SCC).

The Site lies within land between Send Marsh / Burntcommon and the A3 which forms the southeastern edge of the Site. The nearest settlement to the south of Send Marsh / Burntcommon is Clandon, south of the A3.

The edge of the Site is surrounded by mature planting which provides physical and visual containment, particularly from the north, east and west of The Site. There are reciprocal intermittent views to the A3 to the south. There are also long distance views towards elevated land to the south associated with the Hogs Back Ridge formation.

Pylons extend across the Site, and a telecommunications mast is visible to the south of the Site, which in combination with the adjoining settlement edge of Send Marsh / Burntcommon and the presence of the A3 corridor, exert an urbanising influence on the Site.

The Site is divided into a southern and a northern part by a stream corridor and associated mature vegetation. The southern field is a large irregular shaped field tapering to its south-western corner which appears relatively flat, and falls gently towards the stream corridor (35 – 40m AOD). The northern part of the Site comprises a localised hillock formation (+40m AOD) which comprises a grazed field and two more contained parcels of land to the east. The northern part of the site includes a car workshop yard.

The Site and wider landscape comprises parcels of woodland, some of which is ancient woodland including Garlick’s Arch Copse and the northern part of Oldlands Copse, both of which are within the Site.

Land to the north, east and west of the Site comprises residential development within Send Marsh / Burntcommon. The south-eastern boundary of the Site is defined by the A3 which comprises a total of six lanes, which has a national speed limit. Intervening vegetation and an embankment along part of the southern part of the Site boundary with the A3 partially screens visibility into the Site however, there are stretches of open views into the Site from the A3. The Site’s
surroundings include development to the north and west and the A3 road corridor to the south which together have an urbanising effect on the Land at Garlick’s Arch.

The Site is not crossed by any public rights of way (PRoW), is not within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and there are no listed buildings or conservation areas within the vicinity of the Site.

2 Planning Overview

“... the emerging policy therefore sets out clear support for a residential led mixed use development of this site, to provide a valuable contribution towards meeting the Borough’s housing and economic needs.”

The Land at Garlick’s Arch, as identified on page 3, is currently located outside the settlement boundary of Send Marsh and within the Green Belt, as defined by the Council’s 2003 Proposals Map.

As such, existing local planning policies significantly restrict the nature and extent of development that could be achieved on this Site.

However, having regard to the June 2016 Proposed Submission Version of the Local Plan, the Council is proposing to remove the Site from the Green Belt and allocate the Site for residential-led mixed use development. Policy A43 of the emerging Local Plan specifically allocates the Land at Garlick’s Arch for approximately 400 homes.

A number of requirements for the proposed development are also set out within the draft policy, including the provision of appropriate flood risk mitigation, protection of the ancient woodland within the Site and the provision of green corridors and linkages to habitats outside of the Site.

Related to Policy A43, Policy A43a allocates the land immediately adjacent to the A3 Ripley Bypass for new slip roads linking the A247 to the A3. The northbound slip road is to be located within the wider Land at Garlick’s Arch Site identified above.

Associated with the draft allocations, the proposed updates to the Council’s Proposals Map identifies the Site as being within the village Green Belt inset boundary for Send Marsh, and as a specific Site Allocation.

Having regard to the above, the emerging policy therefore sets out clear support for a residential led mixed use development of the Site, to provide a valuable contribution towards meeting the Borough’s housing and economic needs.

3 Why Garlick’s Arch?

Why choose to locate new homes at the Land at Garlick’s Arch over another potential location?

The Land at Garlick’s Arch supports the objectives of the Guildford Borough Council’s emerging Local Plan.

Locating development at Garlick’s Arch provides many strategic benefits from improving visual amenity by under-grounding electrical pylons to helping to relieve congestion through Send Marsh/Ripley and providing facilities and amenities missing in the local area.

The Site enables the release of land to deliver new access slip roads and junction improvements to the A3. However the Site is deliverable regardless of whether the slip roads are constructed.

1. Provide sports pitches and a village green for the benefit of the village

The local area lacks sports provision and a village green. New sports pitches benefit both existing and new residents. The creation of a village green encourages social cohesion and reflects the local settlement pattern of village greens at Send Marsh, Send and Ripley.

2. Relieve congestion in Send Marsh
Potential to relieve traffic pressure at the Send Barns Lane & Clandon/London/Portsmouth Road Roundabout Junction by encouraging traffic through the Land at Garlick’s Arch.

3. Create a park for all in the village to enjoy

Send Marsh/Burntcommon lacks a village park. The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to create a new publicly accessible parkland landscape for new and existing residents to enjoy.

4. Create a village heart

Burntcommon lacks a discernible village heart. The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to create a community focal point for Burntcommon through the creation of a new village heart. The village heart includes a village green, convenience shopping and community space to support daily needs.

5. Improve Visual Amenity

The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to improve local visual amenity by relocating visually unattractive pylons and power cables underground for the benefit of the entire village.

6. Easy access to strategic employment, leisure and recreation destinations (10 minutes)

The Land at Garlick’s Arch is connected, by major infrastructure corridors, to nearby larger settlements that include strategic employment, leisure and recreation.

7. Excellent access to major transport corridors including the A3 and M25

The Site is well connected to major infrastructure corridors including the A3 directly to the south of the Site and the M25 which is approximately 6km from the Site.

8. A visually contained Site

The Site is already visually contained and has the capacity to accommodate new development without significant impact on external views.

9. Opportunity to enhance Burntcommon

The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to enhance Send Marsh/ Burntcommon as a well-rounded settlement by providing facilities currently lacking in the local area.

10. Enable the delivery of A3 slip roads and junction improvements

The Site enables release of land for the delivery of new access slip roads and junction improvements to the A3. However the Site is capable of being delivered entirely independently of the proposed slip roads.

11. Provision of SANG

In accordance with Natural England’s established principles, Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) will be provided for the benefit of residents, with features such as walking/ cycling routes and accessible green space. This will be provided either directly by the developer on land immediately to the southeast of the A3 – less than 1km from the Site, or as a financial contribution towards an existing SANG.

12. Creating local jobs

The provision of 400 homes will support a population of approximately 1,000 people that will help to underpin the viability of existing shops and services – i.e. education, health etc. thereby supporting and creating local jobs.

13. Mitigating noise from A3 to local houses
The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to mitigate the impact of noise generated by the A3 for the existing local residents at Burntcommon and Kiln Lane. Mitigation measures include the creation of a landscape bund, acoustic fence and planting screen.

14. Relieving traffic in Ripley

The Land at Garlick’s Arch provides the opportunity to relieve traffic congestion in Ripley by the release of land to enable delivery of northbound A3 slip roads. Currently all local traffic wishing to access the A3 in the northbound direction passes through Ripley High Street (B2215).

15. Completion of the south eastern extent of the village

Development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch is enclosed by defensible boundaries of neighbouring built areas and the A3. Development at this location provides a logical development parcel for the completion of the village and does not open up the possibility of coalescence or further encroachment in to the Green Belt.

16. Management of landscape assets

The Land at Garlick’s Arch includes a number of valuable landscape assets including Ancient Woodland and watercourses which are unmanaged. Development at the Land at Garlick’s Arch presents an opportunity to actively manage landscape assets and enhance their local heritage and biodiversity value.

17. Creation of a sustainable residential community

The delivery of a mix of residential properties will make a valuable contribution towards the Borough’s housing needs, enhance choice within the local housing market and improve affordability for local people.

4 The Audit

The Audit is a comprehensive analysis of the Site and the wider area, encompassing assessment of access to local facilities, landscape and open space, and connectivity.

Selecting a sustainable site

Access to local facilities is fundamental to the concept of locating sustainable development. New development needs the full range of social, retail, educational, health, transport and recreational facilities to allow people, especially those of limited means or mobility, to go about their daily lives without over reliance on a private car.

Building for Life is a tool to assess and compare the quality of proposed neighbourhoods. It is led by the Design Council CABE, Home Builders Federation and Design for Homes. Whilst Building for Life is usually awarded to completed schemes, the site selection criteria has been applied to the Land at Garlick’s Arch to demonstrate the sustainability of the site as a location for future a neighbourhood extension. Building for Life asks:

1) Does the development provide (or is it close to) community facilities, such as shops, schools, workplaces, parks, play areas, pubs or cafes?

2) Are there enough facilities and services in the local area to support the development? If not, what is needed?

The facilities audit on the next page demonstrates the Land at Garlick’s Arch is a sustainable site location and fully meets the Building for Life criteria through existing local facilities. Shaping Neighbourhoods, a best practice neighbourhood design guide, also suggests the site scores highly as a sustainable location for neighbourhood extensions. This is illustrated on the following pages.

Facilities Audit

Figures 1, 2 and 3 (on the following pages) assess the Land Garlick’s Arch against the accessibility criteria benchmark for new neighbourhoods established by Shaping Neighbourhoods. Fig 1 demonstrates the ideal distances of local facilities for
a sustainable neighbourhood. Fig. 2 illustrates how accessible local facilities are from the site in its current form and Fig. 3 illustrates the accessibility of local facilities when the site is built out.

The facilities audit has highlighted good access to a range of facilities, though access to a local centre, local parks and sports pitches is weak. Fig. 3 illustrates that once the site is built out many of the missing facilities are provided meaning the site exceeds expectations of access to facilities by some margin.

In summary the Land at Garlick’s Arch is a sustainable choice for new development and generally exceeds expectations of access to facilities as identified by ‘Shaping Neighbourhoods’: a best practice design guide for new neighbourhoods’ when fully built out.

**Connectivity Audit: Road Network**

At present the Site is undeveloped. However, as it is used for agricultural purposes it does benefit from vehicular access points onto Portsmouth Road and Kiln Lane, albeit the geometry of these accesses do not accord with current standards for new residential developments. Notwithstanding this, it is noteworthy the predominant land use in this area is residential and the proposals therefore form a natural extension to the existing built up environment.

The local highway network is focused around Portsmouth Road, which is a single carriageway road subject to a 40 mile per hour speed limit. Portsmouth Road provides a connection to Guildford town centre to the west and Junction 10 of the M25 Motorway to the east via the A3. The A3 can be accessed via the A247 (Send Road) and B2215 (London Road) to the west, and the Ockham Interchange to the east. As part of the Strategic Highway Network, the A3 also links the site with Portsmouth and the M3 Motorway (via the A31) to the south west. It is therefore evident that the Site is well located with respect to key local centres and the wider region. The location of the Site in relation to the wider highway network can be seen overleaf.

**Connectivity Audit: Public Transport**

The local pedestrian network connects to the local bus network with the closest bus stops located adjacent to the Portsmouth Road/Burnt Common Lane junction. Given that the bus services that operate from this stop (Routes 462/463 and 515) follow routes that incorporate Cobham, Esher, Guildford, Kingston, Surbiton and Woking, it is evident that the Site is well located to encourage future residents to travel to key local employment and retail centres by public transport. Furthermore, it should be noted that Route 462/463 also stops at Clandon railway station. As this station is served by circa 8 trains per hour (4 to London Waterloo and 4 to Guildford) it is evident that the Site is also well located for people to undertake longer journeys by a combined bus-rail trip.

**Connectivity Audit: Pedestrian Network**

It is generally accepted that walking and cycling provide important alternatives to the private car, and should also be encouraged to form part of longer journeys via public transport. Indeed, it is noteworthy that the Institute of Highways and Transportation (IHT) has prepared several guidance documents that provide advice with respect to the provision of sustainable travel in conjunction with new developments. Within these documents it is suggested that:

- The bicycle is a potential mode of transport for all journeys under five miles (Planning for Cycling, 2015)
- The maximum walk distance for commuting is 2 kilometres (Planning for Walking, 2015)
- Walking distances to bus stops should not exceed 400 metres (Planning for Walking, 2015)

Given the location of the Site, it is considered that it is well situated to encourage less reliance upon the private car. The plan, right, shows the Site is well connected with respect to an extensive network of pedestrian and cycle routes providing excellent access to local countryside, including direct pedestrian links to Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG), and routes towards Ripley to the north and Burpham and Abbotswood to the south west.

Footways incorporate crossing facilities (i.e. dropped kerbs with tactile paving) along key desire lines. In this regard, the Site is well placed to encourage future residents to make use of these important modes of transport when travelling to and from the Site.

[For full comment and appendix, see attachments]
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:  
- Technical Appendix.pdf (6.8 MB)  
- Garlicks Arch Vision Document.pdf (7.3 MB)

Comment ID: PSLPS16/4555  
**Respondent:** 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I OBJECT to the inclusion of strategic site Policy(A43 Garlick's Arch and its late substitution in the Local Plan with no prior consultation with the local community. This site should be protected as it is agricultural land that is previously undeveloped and within the Green Belt. There is no sound reasoning as to why the Garlick's Arch site was substituted at the last minute on 24th May 2016 in preference to the original site A43 Land at Burnt Common Warehouse which is an existing brownfield site with industrial space, provision for at least a further 7000sqm of industrial employment space and an additional 100 homes which is more in keeping with the acceptable growth in housing numbers for the residents of Send, Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley. The development of 400 homes at the Garlick's Arch site will cause coalescence with Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley thus losing forever the independent identity of each village and hamlet.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/7726  
**Respondent:** 15922337 / Andrew Malcher  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2016 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

We object to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. Garlick’s Arch is in the Green Belt. It is designated as Priority Habitat and Ancient woodland. This is an irreplaceable asset and should be protected. The Green belt in Guildford does not “belong” to the people of Guildford alone. Across the county, indeed across the whole of England there are many people who love the Guildford countryside. Countryside like the Hogs Back, for example, “belongs” to us all; our green and pleasant land, the natural landscape and it’s rich biodiversity is part of our common heritage.

Green belt land is a finite resource, once developed it is gone forever.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5209  
**Respondent:** 17111233 / Tony Wales  
**Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**
Having seen the proposed changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan, I am seriously concerned about the proposals around Burnt Common (plan 43).

From a transport viewpoint, the proposal to install a new exit ramp from the A3 at Burnt Common seems to be ill-thought out and counter-productive. I appreciate the need to relieve the volume of traffic through Ripley, but by adding a new exit from the A3 at Burnt Common, it will merely transfer the problem to the A247 and the villages of West Clandon, Send and surrounding areas. In particular, this will encourage traffic to use a ‘rat run’ through these villages to the southern areas of Guildford.

Please note the following important points:

1. The A247 is not a wide road and becomes exceptionally narrow as it passes through the West Clandon Conservation Area, where two large vehicles (lorries, buses) cannot easily pass each other.
2. There is no prospect of widening the A247 at this point as there are conservation properties close to the road boundary on both sides.
3. There is already limited access for pedestrians with a single, narrow pavement and any increased volume of traffic is likely to increase the risks for pedestrians.
4. West Clandon is a ‘ribbon village’ which is laid out along the path of the A247 as it becomes The Street. There is no village square or centre. Any increase in traffic along The Street would have a seriously detrimental impact on the life of the village, which would become dissected by an increasingly busy, major road.
5. There would be no benefit to the local residents of this area, as it merely gives greater access to through traffic at a serious cost to the detriment of the local area.

From a housing viewpoint, the Burnt Common proposals to create 1,700 new dwellings seem similarly ill-thought out. There is no infrastructure to support such a large development. Please note the following points:

1. There is an extremely limited bus service and the nearest rail station (Clandon) would be a 30 minutes’ walk. This would mean that the new residents would be forced to rely on car transport, thereby adding a severe load to the local roads which are already becoming congested.
2. There are no local shops and limited availability of schools in the area.
3. The proposals would merely create an isolated housing estate.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/78  Respondent: 17133121 / Catherine Rose  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the fact that you are going to ruin beautiful parts of Surrey with your plans. These areas are beautiful spots in Surrey away from the noise and bustle of the nearby towns. Common sense must prevail here, surely?

-I object to any development on Site A43 at Garlicks Arch as this would be on Green Belt Land - there is nothing identified or exception in the Local Plan documentation.

-I object to including 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan.
- I object further to the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. The Plan itself has huge discrepancies and is therefore not properly constituted.

- I object to the potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. The plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing”. So the creation of even more travellers pitches and houses, which you are yet to justify.

- I object to Section 4.2.22 of the Plan which states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why on earth would you put 75% of them in Ripley? This is ridiculously unbalanced.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/243  Respondent: 17148161 / Sally Hall Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to the Policy A43 change Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh because:

• There is no proven demand for any travelling showpeople slots in this location
• It will generate excessive traffic further blocking the local roads of Send and Ripley
• Again this area is subject to frequent flooding, being in a flood zone 2 allocation
• It seems once again to ignore the thousands of previous objections made by local residents
• This area has been contaminated by over 50 years of lead shot accumulation
• It is an obvious overdevelopment of the village and in addition the number of homes (400) is excessive
• This is a permanent Green Belt area and no ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist for this beautiful area
• This is an area of ancient woodland which existed in the time of Elizabeth 1, and it is exceptional
• This will cause a ‘joining up’ of Send and Ripley, which defeats the purpose of the Green Belt.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/291  Respondent: 17158849 / Gwenda Wakefield Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It is Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist.

It is ancient woodland that has existed for 100’s of years.
The number of homes is excessive and will cause over development of our village.  

It defeats the key purpose of Green Belt by joining Ripley and Send.  

The additional traffic created will block up our local roads.  

There is no demand for Travelling plots at this location.  

I believe the site is contaminated by lead shot and is currently in a flood zone.  

It also ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by us, the local people.  

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**  

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy change at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43 because :-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ignores the many previous objections to this scheme made by local residents. There is no demand in the hinterland of Send village for accommodation for &quot;Travelling Showpeople&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site includes ancient woodland which acts as an environmental buffer between the A3 Ripley Bye-pass and the local properties. What research/desk studies have been completed to identify the flora and fauna which is present and would be irrevocably lost by approving this development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ripley &amp; Send would join into a ribbon development which is against the principles of the Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The increase in effluent requiring treatment would result in difficulties in conforming with the Water Framework Directive with regard to discharge of treated effluent into the nearby River Wey/Wey Navigation canal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This site is liable to flooding, being classified as flood zone 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a risk that the site includes contaminated land. Has a Desk Study, supported by intrusive investigation been completed to identify the scope of remedial works necessary to make the site suitable for development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The development will result in a significant increase in traffic which the local road infrastructure cannot sustain. Currently, there is a vehicle queue of at least 100 yds every morning at peak traffic flow in Send Marsh Road B368, trying to access the Portsmouth Road B2215. This situation will be exacerbated by the proposed development with a resultant increase in the risk of accidents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because the site floods regularly (designated as flood zone 2) and is covered by ancient woodland, up to 500 years old, which is home to a variety of wildlife. The currently existing brownfield sites within Guildford and its surrounding areas should be fully utilised before any housing is agreed within Green Field sites. There is no proven demand for traveller sites in the location and the addition of 400 houses in a small area defies all previous objections to this proposal and is a total over-development of the village. It will essentially create a "super-village" by which Ripley and Send are amalgamated into one and the increase in volume of traffic within the small roads and lanes around the villages will not be able to cope. There are no proposals around the increase in additional services, such as schools, doctors, shops or road improvements for the local village.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/351  Respondent: 17161889 / Mark Gurden  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object very strongly to Policy A43, land at Garlicks Arch. It is unacceptable that you have ignored the thousands of previous objections to this proposal. There is already far too much traffic in the Ripley/Send area and this will create so much more and will effectively join the 2 towns together, defeating one of the purposes of the Green Belt.

Also I do not believe that there has been any demand for Travellers sites, so why are they being created?

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/355  Respondent: 17163361 / Victoria Marr  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

- Any development at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation
- The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan
- The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. The Plan is self-inconsistent and therefore not properly constituted.
- The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages. The plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing”. So even more travellers pitches and houses, which is unjustified.
- Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.
• The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/362   Respondent:  17163425 / Richard Turner   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 – I object to Policy A43. This massive increase in housing plus travelling show-people plots is an over-development that would destroy the Green Belt and woodland, join up Ripley and Send plus yet again put additional stress on the fragile traffic system in and around Send, Ripley and the A3. This is also against previous objections and is frustrating to see on the plan.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/389   Respondent:  17166241 / Eloise Knights   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/392   Respondent:  17167969 / Harry Knights   Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to Policy A43 change - Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh because it ignores thousands of previous objections made by local people. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location. It will cause over development of our village generating excessive traffic and ruin for ever the green open space that should be protected for future generations to enjoy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the policy A43 land at Garlicks Arch at Send Marsh on two accounts: one there is no proven need for travelling show people in this area. This number of homes (400) will join Ripley and Send into one huge conurbation. Traffic on the Portsmouth road in over crowded and dangerout now and with cars that 400 homes will produce will make the morning and evening commute into one long and miserable traffic jam.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A43 because:

- This is Green Belt, and no exceptional circumstances exist.
- It is a site of ancient woodland.
- The site is subject to frequent flooding.
- The additional traffic generated will cause traffic jams in Send.
- There is no shown demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and is not wanted
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is hugely excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads even more than already does of Send and Ripley
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/678  Respondent: 17199969 / Lucy Barker  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Housing at Garlicks Arch would be on greenbelt, harmful to the Land and existing villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/682  Respondent: 17200033 / Eileen Barr  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

We object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because it ignores the thousands of previous objections, the provision of 8 Travelling Showpeople plots is out of proportion, the number of houses is excessive and will cause the loss of ancient woodland, might exacerbate flooding in the area and will generate excessive traffic on roads and villages which cannot cope with the present volume of traffic at peak times. We are retired so don't travel to work during rush hour but if we have a doctor's appointment the volume of traffic has a significant impact.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/769  Respondent: 17205089 / Janet A Parry-Moms  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

object to the Policy A 43 change at Garlick's Arch because:Previous objections from local people have been ignored.No 'exceptional circumstances' exist to damage the Green Belt permanently.No reason for Travelling Showpeople plots has been proven.There would be excessive homes, and our village would be over-developed.The area is subject to frequent flooding, which would be made worse.Local traffic issues would worsen.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/768  Respondent: 17205121 / Madeleine Davis  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document:</th>
<th>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object strongly to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed number of 400 homes is excessive. We do not have the schools and medical services large enough to cope with this influx of at least another 800 people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripley and Send will be joined up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousands of previous objections have been blatently ignored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ancient woodland and needs to be protected at all costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and subject to frequent flooding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifty years of shooting has resulted in contamination by lead shot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The traffic in the area is already excessive, with long delays occurring in Send Marsh Road and Send Road at peak times. The proposed increase in housing will only exacerbate the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment ID: pslp172/774  Respondent: 17205249 / Dorothy Ann Sprigings  Agent: |
| **Document:  | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
| I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because: it ignores the thousands of objections already made by local people.it is permanent Green Belt and there are no 'Exceptional Circumstances'.the number of proposed homes is excessive, causing over-development, and will join Ripley andSend, thus destroying the Green Belt purpose.it will cause excessive traffic, choking the local roads of Ripley and Send.provision of plots for Travelling Showpeople has not beenproved to be required here, and the provision is only valid policy for sites of more than 500 dwellings. The plan is self-inconsistent. |
| **What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?** |
| Attached documents: |

| Comment ID: pslp172/841  Respondent: 17206209 / Jenna Crombie  Agent: |
| **Document:  | Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |
| **Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )** |
I object to the amendment to A43, in that it not only fails to reduce the number of homes still proposed (remaining at the disproportionately high number of 400), but it also adds the provision of sites for 'Travelling Show People'.

I object in the strongest possible terms to the impact these recommendations will have on local roads (volume of traffic and addition to the already high level of general and noise pollution), the destruction of greenbelt and the undeniable ruining of the village of Send by placing a disproportionately high burden on Send (why are these housing needs not being more evenly distributed across the borough?) There are also other nearby developments in the Horsley and Clandon areas that means a huge volume of this change will impact a small patch of the borough and the proposed infrastructure changes will not be sufficient - even if they are carried through in every instance, which seems extremely unlikely given the current and future chronic pressures on public funding.

Are residents to be compensated for the destruction of greenbelt, impact on their local services and very likely negative impact on house prices?

The plan should be amended to more evenly share the burden across the borough. The plan should also remove provision of sites for 'Travelling show people' under A43. There is already increasingly heavy traffic traveling through Send accessing the A3 road and Old Woking/Woking. These changes will further impact these roads and negatively impact residents wellbeing (pollution and the stress of additional traffic and noise pollution).

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
This also leads to my objection of policy A43 and the proposals for the land at Garlicks Arch. Not only does it ignore the thousands of previous objections made, there is no proven demand for traveller plots in this location or for a development of this size in this area. It will cause significant over development of our village and increase the already excessive levels of traffic that already cause huge builds of traffic within both Send and Ripley.

Such proposals simply cannot go ahead. It is damaging the green belt and will cause severe unrest for those residence living in the

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/855  Respondent: 17210145 / Tim Crook  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development at the Garlick's Arch site. I object for the following reasons:

- the proposed houses would be on Greenbelt Land

- the potential increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause these villages to merge.

- the inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Greenbelt. There is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation. The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan and so is out of scale with the proposed development.

- the potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1092  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent:  
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1094  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)

This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
   i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!), and
   ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1096  Respondent: 17241889 / John Hackney  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

   1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
   2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1139</th>
<th>Respondent: 17244001 / June Marie</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the inclusion of land at Garlick's Arch. It is subject to flooding, contains ancient woodlands- over 80 oak trees. It is a habitat for wildlife. Have not seen any wildlife report in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1201</th>
<th>Respondent: 17247169 / Ben Greaves</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)  
I object to Garlick's Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.  
I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick's Arch  
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.  
I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick's Arch  
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 (Garlick's Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.  
The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick's Arch)  
GBC's own reasons for including Garlick's Arch A43 in the 2016 version were  
a) The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, ... (site allocation 425) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”  
b) The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs” |
| Attached documents: |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1265</th>
<th>Respondent: 17249217 / David L. Hall</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch –Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley

Again, the many thousands of objections to the proposed development in the 2016 Consultation have been completely ignored with respect to this Green Belt land.

Now 8 Pitches/Plots for ‘Travelling/Showpeople have been added to the original 400 houses, without any proven demand or requirement.

There has not been any visible consideration given to the infrastructure which would be required to support this type of expansion. This proposal is impractical.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

| Comment ID: pslp172/1255 | Respondent: 17249601 / Penelope Moore | Agent: |
| Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 |

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

**I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)**

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There appear to be no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

**I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch**

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be **no** inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

**I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch**

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

**The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch**

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. *The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ”]*

2. *The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”*

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1357  Respondent: 17256577 / Tina Makin  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlick’s Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/1381  Respondent: 17267265 / Patricia & Normal Bloomfield  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.
I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and is not wanted
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is hugely excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads even more than already does of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I would like to state that I am not against all new build policies – I have children in their twenties who need homes and recognise the need to increase the housing stock. However, this development needs to be within current village boundaries, and in areas where School and Medical provision is adequate. Wisley Aerodrome is a site which makes total sense to me, due to the location near the A3/M25 and the fact that it is already mostly covered in concrete.

Please take the views of those who live locally into serious consideration!

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** psp172/1659  **Respondent:** 17283297 / John Ball  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on their way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial
(B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

27. Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
We need proper consultation on any plans for Waste Management Facilities and the increase in industrial floorspace. Many local people are hugely concerned about many aspects of this plan and the potentially negative impact it will have on our local RURAL environment and our quality of life.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/1711**  **Respondent: 17285249 / Stephen Green**  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It will cause the village to be ‘over-developed’ with the consequent impact on local services such as schools and health services which are already stretched
- It will join up the villages of Ripley and Send into one ribbon development and so defeat the key purpose of having a Green Belt
- It is a flood zone 2 area
- It will cause excessive traffic which will increase air pollution and cause congestion

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID: pslp172/1731**  **Respondent: 17285569 / Angela Smith**  **Agent:**

**Document:**  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores the THOUSANDS of previous objections made by local people
- There is NO PROVEN DEMAND for Travelling Show-people plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our villages and the number of homes is excessive
- It is glorious ancient woodland that has existed from the time of Elizabeth 1. It is vandalism of the greatest order to demolish an area of such wonderful heritage.
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is liable to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years

It will cause massive traffic congestion that will block the local roads of Send and Ripley

It will ramp up (already unacceptably high levels of) air pollution

It does not address the problem of inadequate infrastructure – roads, schools, medical facilities – AS REQUIRED BY LAW

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1769  Respondent: 17286657 / Kristine Good  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43.

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/1809  Respondent: 17288289 / Ken Grainger  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople in this location which would seriously adversely affect the value of nearby properties
It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances exist

It will cause serious implications to the village and the number of proposed homes is excessive as our schools are already stretched to their capacity

It is exquisite ancient woodland and should always be preserved

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

It is already subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation

It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over more than 50 years

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley which are already at an unacceptable level

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1829</th>
<th>Respondent: 17288513 / Andrew Bedworth</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1835</th>
<th>Respondent: 17288705 / Lesley Davies</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

SITE A43, GARLICKS ARCH
The original proposal has been changed to now include a minimum of 400 houses, meaning that up to 650 houses will be built on this site. In addition, this allows for 6 travellers sites with associated mixed use yards and storage. This is greenbelt land and the increase in houses and buildings are harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send, and Clandon. The inclusion of the travellers sites is inappropriate in a rural environment within the greenbelt and there is no identified need.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the **thousands of previous objections** made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley - this is of significant concern to me as I live on Send Road, the traffic is already heavy and can also be very fast.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Policy A43 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because we have recently moved to this small village to escape the throng and the increase to 60 homes in place of 45 is too much, and whilst ignoring hundreds of previous objection, it will make access and traffic problem in Tannery Lane and at the A247 junction worse than at present. It will cover more of the Green Belt thus making surface water flooding even worse than at present, and will impact open countryside views from the River Wey Navigation system.

We also object to Policy A43 - land at Garlick’s Arch, Send March because again it ignores all the previous objections make by the local people. There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location and it is beautiful permanent Green Belt which should stay that way as no “exceptional circumstances” exist. It will cause over-development of the village and the 400 homes is excessive. The ancient woodland will be destroyed and that was in existence at the time of Elizabeth 1. It will join up Ripley and Send, thus defeating the key purpose of the Green Belt and it is subject to frequent flooding and is currently in flood zone 2. It has lead shot contamination and will generate excessive traffic that will further block the local roads of Send and Ripley.
**Comment ID:** pslp172/1885  **Respondent:** 17291329 / Charmian Leach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to Land at Garlick’s Arch, policy A43 because:

- there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

- there are no “exceptional circumstances” to remove the green belt here and removal will join up Send and Ripley, a key reason for the greenbelt?

- it is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and this proposed development will make it worse.

- at 400 it is clear the number of homes is excessive.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1888  **Respondent:** 17291361 / Ron Leach  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to Land at Garlick’s Arch, policy A43 because:

- there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

- there are no “exceptional circumstances” to remove the green belt here and removal will join up Send and Ripley, a key reason for the greenbelt?

- it is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and this proposed development will make it worse.

- at 400 it is clear the number of homes is excessive.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/1897  **Respondent:** 17291553 / James Hitchings  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I wish to object to Land at Garlick’s Arch, policy A43 because:

- there is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

- there are no “exceptional circumstances” to remove the green belt here and removal will join up Send and Ripley, a key reason for the greenbelt?

- it is currently a flood zone 2 allocation and this proposed development will make it worse.

- at 400 it is clear the number of homes is excessive.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, ... (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

"We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/1968</th>
<th>Respondent: 17293121 / Glyn Nicholson-Ross</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to your plans to increase the development in the Garlick's Arch area particularly as you have shown nowhere in the plan why you feel this development is necessary. The area falls within Green Belt land and, as such, you need to show exceptional need before allowing development to happen. If your proposals are allowed to go ahead it will mean that Clandon .. Ripley and Send simply merge together into one expanse of buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2037</th>
<th>Respondent: 17295265 / Brian McGee</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Garlick’s Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen (implies storage yards and long vehicles). This will generate traffic on the A247.

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2139  Respondent: 17300737 / Katy Di Rienzo  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to Policy A43 (Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh) because

Again, the local infrastructure could not support such a change and would significantly worsen access to the A3 and local traffic issues but beyond that, local schools and medical amenities are not at a level where they could deal with such an increased local populace.

Again, it ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people;

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

I find it difficult to understand why, rather than listen to the thousands of previous objections from local people, Guildford Borough Council have in fact far worsened the proposed developments for Send Village and associated green belt within the recent iteration of the Local Plan and really demonstrates an authority that is not listening.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2144  Respondent: 17300865 / Felice Di Rienzo  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 (Garlicks Arch, Send Marsh) because

Again, the local infrastructure could not support such a change and would significantly worsen access to the A3 and local traffic issues but beyond that, local schools and medical amenities are not at a level where they could deal with such an increased local populace.

Again, it ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people;

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

I find it difficult to understand why, rather than listen to the thousands of previous objections from local people, Guildford Borough Council have in fact far worsened the proposed developments for Send Village and associated green belt within the recent iteration of the Local Plan and really demonstrates an authority that is not listening.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2156  Respondent: 17301089 / Amanda Alexander  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Firstly, I object to development on site A43, Garlic Arch is STILL Green Belt land and this amount of development, 1500-1999 homes, an INCREASE of 400 houses, is inappropriate for the area. The addition of six Traveller Plots, amongst/as well as all these houses in a rural area is completely harmful for wildlife and people alike.
Why do we need 6 new traveller sites? It is disproportionate and unfair to put such a heavy load, all in one area. I strongly object to this.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

- We simply do not have the road infrastructure to deal with large new developments & the additional road traffic this will bring. Ripley high street is already gridlocked every rush hour, twice a day with vehicles trying to get in & out of Newark Lane and to and from the A3. It’s already way over capacity, so to suggest a further cars and vans/lorries is completely unfeasible. How will small high streets such as Send and Old Woking be able to cope with this volume of additional traffic for families getting to and from Woking – White Rose Lane is yet another road that already is jam-packed?
- Air pollution will rise substantially with this proposed increase to road traffic.
- Woking station doesn’t have the capacity to deal with additional parking on this scale to cope with this amount of additional commuters.
- No bus services run prior to rush hour to get people to Woking/Guildford stations.
- Send Villages Medical Centre: Its already a nightmare getting an appointment to see a doctor – will you be building an additional facility of larger capacity in Ripley and if so where?
- Any development at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation.
- The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan.
- The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. The Plan is self-inconsistent and therefore not properly constituted.
- The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remains unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing“. So even more travellers pitches and houses, which is unjustified.

- Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” So why do 75% of them have to be in Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair.
- The removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) has left the Plan even further unbalanced against the North East of the Borough with over 40% of the development proposed in this small area of Green Belt, all within just 3 miles of Send Marsh.
- The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000 sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
### Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

**Policy A43 Garlicks Arch**

I have objected to the proposed development of 400 houses on Green Belt and good agricultural land. This new policy adds 8 travelling-show people pitches to the development making this development even even more inappropriate for this area. The Borough Council, 3 years ago, actively turned down a planning application from ‘Old lands’ to build 25 homes in the same location. So the Council cannot include this policy within the plan and maintain that it applies consistent and good policy.

I strongly object to the revised proposal for following reasons

1. The village has no shops or other infrastructure to support the development.
2. Additional traffic generated would create huge congestion on our already over crowded roads in Send, Send Marsh, Burnt Common and Ripley.
3. No exceptional circumstances exist to destroy this Green Belt land and ancient woodland in the [illegible word]
4. There is no proven demand for travelling/show people in the area.
5. The village of Send Marsh/Burnt Common, and Ripley would have their distinct characteristics destroyed.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2258  **Respondent:** 17302273 / R Singleton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

### Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the A43 changes at Garlick's Arch as follows:

1. YOU have completely ignored the thousands of previous objections made by local people
2. Why should there be a plot for Travelling Show people in this location when there Is 'lc proven demand for this These people lead a transient lifestyle and therefore ere is no need to provide them with a plot of land.
3. You have not provided nor can you justify your reasons for proposing to build on the beautiful permanent Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances to allow you to do this.
4. Your proposals will mean our village is 'over developed' and the number of homes excessive.
5. We have beautiful and exquisite ancient woodland that have existed since the time of Elizabeth 1, why do you want to destroy this?
6. These changes will join up Ripley and Send and completely defeat the purpose of the Green Belt.
7. This area is subject to flooding and is currently in flood zone 2 and it is contaminated with lead shot which has built up over the last 50 years.
8. It will generate more traffic that will cause chaos in the local roads of Ripley and Send.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**
Comment ID: pslp172/2263  Respondent: 17302497 / F Bennett  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2272  Respondent: 17302753 / Mark & Lucy Ingram  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

strongly object to the following proposals set out in the document:

Garlick's Arch development of 400+ houses and facilities for travelling showmen

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2317  Respondent: 17303745 / Christine M Macnair  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.
I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A34 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2371  Respondent: 17304865 / A Cruse  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to further extensions to Garlick’s Arch (A43) and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2374  Respondent: 17304865 / A Cruse  Agent: 
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

I object to the unfair imbalance of the Plan across the borough.

With the removal of site A46 from the Plan (with its proposed 1100 houses) and reductions of housing planned in this version of the Plan in other parts of the borough the Plan has become even more biased against the North East of the borough. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were
The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, (site allocation A25) [than the Burnt Common site did]

The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs.

Since AS8 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since AS8 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

I strongly object to removing Send Business Park from the Green Belt (4.3.15).

Send Business park is a very small collection of local businesses in a very rural area in the Green Belt. There can be no justification for it’s insetting (removal) from the Green Belt, and indeed GBC have not even attempted one. Therefore no “exceptional circumstances”, as required by the NPPF can be claimed.

I strongly object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:

“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan.”

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

I wish these objections to be fully taken into consideration and that the Plan is amended accordingly.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2411</th>
<th>Respondent: 17308417 / Shirley Bowerman</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I object because the proposal ignores all the thousands of objections made by local people and makes things much worse by including even more houses, which looks like a punishment of local people having the temerity to object.

I object because there is no proven demand for travelling show-people in this location.

I object because this site is beautiful Green Belt land and there are no exceptional circumstances to merit removing this protection.

I object because it is grossly excessive development of our village and the number of houses proposed is overwhelmingly too many.

I object because this is a site of wonderful ancient woodland that dates back to medieval times.

I object because this proposal will connect Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Belt.
I object because the site often floods and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.

I object because the site is contaminated with lead shot which has been accumulating for 50 years.

I object because the enormous amount of traffic which will be generated by this proposal will catastrophically clog up the roads of both Send and Ripley, many of which can barely take two lines of traffic. It will also make the clogging up of the nearby Guildford By-pass disastrously worse. One wonders whether the proposers of this policy ever use the by-pass, particularly travelling south, when bottle-necking can extend right to Burpham even on an ordinary weekday.

I object because potential objectors have never been shown the figures on which the proposed number of additional houses is based and which can only be of benefit to those who stand to profit from such proposals. Justice must not only be done but must be visibly and manifestly be seen to be

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2496  **Respondent:** 17316033 / Anne Morris  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Housing at Site A43 Garlicks Arch would be on greenbelt land. The potential increase in the proposed 400 dwellings to 650, would be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages. The inclusion of 6 x travelling show people plots with associated storage facilities is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the greenbelt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan documentation. The allocation of 6 travelling show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 local plan and so it is out of scale with the proposed development. The potential for a substantial increase in industrial floorspace from 7000sq m to an unspecified amount at the site A58 Burnt Common does not provide local residents with enough information for a full and proper consultation given the ambiguity and lack of detail within the document. The potential for a waste management facility at site A58 Burnt Common is briefly mentioned and does not allow for full and proper consultation.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/2499  **Respondent:** 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks.
Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

As explained having only just moved into the area, I was not aware of the congestion on Send Barnes Lane. I have quickly come to realise this road is used as a main cut through to get to the A3 to Woking and vice versa. Only this morning I found myself having to queue for some time to get out of my own road. This will only be compounded with the amount of vehicles using the road should the large amount of additional housing be created.

My children go to the local school and in the two weeks they have been there I have been shocked at both the speed and size of vehicles using the road. Having already moved away from an area due to health concerns it causes me great anxiety to think this could happen again. I have seen one of the parents taking matters into her own hands and wearing a hi viz jacket and waving a 30mph sign at drivers, such is the concern of such a busy road which will only get worse if the vast amount of houses are built.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/2502  Respondent: 17316257 / Neeley Jackson  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. The inclusion of site A58 Burnt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3071  Respondent: 17321089 / David Banham  Agent: 
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43  
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
I object to the Policy M3 change at Garlick's Arch because:
It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley
There is not currently sufficient infrastructure, roads and schools, to support the proposed increase in demand that will be placed upon the area with the proposed plans.
The additional traffic will cause a significant increase in rush hour traffic trying to gain access to the A3, which already queues through the villages of Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan. Furthermore A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots …” Clearly A50 more than covers the total "need" of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch)

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm,… (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”

The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh

I object to the proposed allocation for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt. There is insufficient services infrastructure for housing and show people plots, nor any justification for concentrating 6 of the proposed 8 borough-wide show people plots within Send. The road network is insufficient for housing development on this scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

----

I object to the Policy A43 Change at Garlick's Arch because:

1. a) It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
1. b) It will generate excessive traffic that will block the local roads in Send and Ripley
1. c) There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots on this location
1. d) It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
1. e) It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
1. f) It will join Ripley up with Send and defeat the object of the Green Belt
1. g) It is an exquisite ancient woodland that existed in the time of Elizabeth I
1. h) It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently in a flood zone 2 allocation
1. i) The land has been contaminated by lead shot for over fifty years

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

----

I object to the Policy A43 Change at Garlick's Arch because:

1. a) It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
1. b) It will generate excessive traffic that will block the local roads in Send and Ripley
1. c) There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots on this location
1. d) It will cause over development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
1. e) It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist
1. f) It will join Ripley up with Send and defeat the object of the Green Belt
1. g) It is an exquisite ancient woodland that existed in the time of Elizabeth I
1. h) It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently in a flood zone 2 allocation
1. i) The land has been contaminated by lead shot for over fifty years

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh

I object to the proposed allocation for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt. There is insufficient services infrastructure for housing and show people plots, nor any justification for concentrating 6 of the proposed 8 borough-wide show people plots within Send. The road network is insufficient for housing development on this scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2645  Respondent: 17329537 / D S White  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch I have been unable to find any justification in the Plan that requires the inclusion of a site for Travelling Showmen in this area. Travelling Showmen, by the very nature of their business TRAVEL. Is this site inclusion at Garlick's Arch for their winter quarters? We are all aware "when the fair comes to town" of the size and nature of showmen's vehicles and equipment and the long running of diesel generators with consequent atmospheric pollution. Yet again the wanton destruction of Green Belt and historic woodland. The increase of some likely 800 additional vehicle movements, on the naïve assumption of one car per household, in the immediate area to schools, doctor's surgery and supermarkets and workplaces.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2941  Respondent: 17344801 / Graham Rendell  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because a development of this size would put massive strain on the local infrastructure. For example it is already difficult to get an appointment at the local doctors in the Village health Centre and as far as I know there are no NHS dentist places available.

I would be concerned about the amount of traffic not just caused by people going to work and congesting the various access roads but also the total volume of cars in the area filling car parks. It is already difficult to park in the Cobham and Guildford public car parks and even the private super stores in Cobham and Ladymead are often full to capacity. An overall increase in traffic in the area is bound to increase in air pollution decrease in air quality which I think is in direct conflict with government policy.

I thought the point of the GREEN BELT was to stop the complete urbanisation of our country areas. It seems to me the Garick's Arch development will effectively join up the existing communities into one mass of houses.

I have no first hand experience of the schools in the area but I assume that a new school would need to be provided. With those students coming from this new estate would isolate them from the wider community.

As for the inclusion of Travelling Show people plots I am left dumfounded as to why greenbelt land should be ruined in
Another personal issue of concern I have is that of the interference with land drainage. My property was one of those flooded around 2001. An excellent flood prevention scheme was installed which seems to have prevented further flooding. However, given the flood water came from this proposed area I am very concerned that altering the use of this land will upset the drainage and once again put our properties in danger.

Finally the proposed development on the **Wisley Airfield** would I think put just as much strain on the area as the **Garlick's Arch** plan. Particularly the increase in traffic and impact on local facilities. It would obviously put major pressure on the small back roads into Cobham which I believe would make those small roads extremely dangerous. An increase in traffic through Ripley would cause massive congestion not seen since before the Ripley By-Pass was built - yes I am old enough to remember those times - with again an increase in air pollution and a decrease in air quality.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3112</th>
<th>Respondent: 17344801 / Graham Rendell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because** a development of this size would put massive strain on the local infrastructure. For example it is already difficult to get an appointment at the local doctors in the Village health Centre and as far as I know there are no NHS dentist places available.

I would be concerned about the amount of traffic not just caused by people going to work and congesting the various access roads but also the total volume of cars in the area filling car parks. It is already difficult to park in the Cobham and Guildford public car parks and even the private super stores in Cobham and Ladymead are often full to capacity. An overall increase in traffic in the area is bound to increase in air pollution decrease in air quality which I think is in direct conflict with government policy.

I thought the point of the GREEN BELT was to stop the complete urbanisation of our country areas. It seems to me the Garlick's Arch development will effectively join up the existing communities into one mass of houses.

I have no first hand experience of the schools in the area but I assume that a new school would need to be provided. With those students coming from this new estate would isolate them from the wider community.

As for the inclusion of Travelling Show people plots I am left dumbfounded as to why greenbelt land should be ruined in this way.

Another personal issue of concern I have is that of the interference with land drainage. My property was one of those flooded around 2001. An excellent flood prevention scheme was installed which seems to have prevented further flooding. However, given the flood water came from this proposed area I am very concerned that altering the use of this land will upset the drainage and once again put our properties in danger.

**I object to the Policy A42 change at Clockbarn in Tannery Lane because** again this could also radically change the drainage in the area.

Many of my previous points also are reliant to this plan including the increase in traffic and more erosion of the greenbelt.
Given that so many objections were made to the previous plan it seems that by increasing the size of the development with this plan you are totally ignoring the wishes of the local community.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2773  Respondent: 17357249 / E Turner  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I strongly object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended. This will cause excessive urban sprawl. This site should not be removed from green belt – there are no excessive reasons for this.

I strongly object to the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople sites A34 Garlicks Arch. This site is for 400 homes and is therefore not compliant with the minimum of 500 stated in section 4.2.24 of the plan. A50 covers total need of 8 so there is no need for these on site A43.

I object to lacking proper infrastructure planning for site A43 and A42. Foreward to plan stated by Paul Spooner recognises ‘the signification infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and planned overgrowth of the borough?. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure which is a key theme of our local plan. Development of sites A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Send would therefore be contrary to stated aims and items of the Plan and should not go ahead.

I therefore strongly object to all proposed development A34, A43, A58, A42 on the grounds that the area will be grossly overcrowded causing urban sprawl. The roads are already at maximum capacity. One small breakdown occurrence in area causes vast traffic jams. I also object to the fact that the Guildford Borough Council ignored the thousands of objections from the Send/Ripley area and instead increased the allocation of housing etc.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2826  Respondent: 17366145 / Tara Cooling  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch. There have already been thousands of previous objections made by us local people opposed to this plan. To date there has been no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location so why should we cater for this? This is a stunning Green Belt area that we should protect and not build upon. This area is subject to frequent flooding and should not be built upon.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/2901  Respondent: 17370209 / T Hodkinson  Agent:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/2934</th>
<th>Respondent: 17373505 / Paul Beach</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I OBJECT to any removal of ancient woodland on the A43 Site.</td>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3013</th>
<th>Respondent: 17380161 / Nicola Banham</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is <strong>Sound</strong>? ( ), is <strong>Legally Compliant</strong>? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43, land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh for the following reasons:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This totally ignores hundreds of previous objections by local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are no ‘exceptional circumstances’ as required by the National Planning Policy to take this area out of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This will remove ancient woodland which cannot ever by regained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ripley and Send villages will merge, therefore defeating the purpose of the Green Belt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The number of homes proposed is excessive. Send is a village. This is over-development to the extreme.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The area is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a Flood Zone 2 allocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The excessive traffic that will be generated will totally cause mayhem on the Send and Ripley roads. Already whenever there is a road closure nearby or traffic accident (almost a daily occurrence on the A3/M25) in the vicinity – the main Ripley, Send Marsh and Send roads are ridiculously congested or at a total standstill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There is no proven demand for Travelling Show people sites in this location. This development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Guildford Borough is over 100 square miles. Of the 11350 homes proposed in the Plan, 40.6% (4613) are within 3 miles of Send Marsh, most of them on Green Belt. This is grossly unfair on an already overcrowded part of the borough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley
• There is not currently sufficient infrastructure, roads and schools, to support the proposed increase in demand that will be placed upon the area with the proposed plans.
• The additional traffic will cause a significant increase in rush hour traffic trying to gain access to the A3, which already queues through the villages of Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3051  Respondent: 17380161 / Nicola Banham  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley
There is not currently sufficient infrastructure, roads and schools, to support the proposed increase in demand that will be placed upon the area with the proposed plans.
The additional traffic will cause a significant increase in rush hour traffic trying to gain access to the A3, which already queues through the villages of Ripley and Send.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3083  Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the hiding of development by ‘deferment’ (A24, A25, A26, A43):
This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by ‘deferring’ it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This has two effects:

1. to hide the number of houses actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1,100 deferred, but still being built), and
2. to give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3084</th>
<th>Respondent: 17383969 / Maureen Mitchell Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to Garlicks Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the allocation of six Travelling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlicks Arch:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation of six Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3177</th>
<th>Respondent: 17399681 / Anthony Smith Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.2.24 of the Plan states that ‘Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation is required within development sites of 500 homes or more to help create sustainable, mixed communities with suitable accommodation for all’. Therefore there should be no Travelling Showpeople plots at A43 (Garlicks Arch), which is designated for 400 homes. In this connection the failure to amend Policy A44 (Land west of Send Hill) to remove travellers’ pitches is astounding, since this Policy provides for 2 travellers’ pitches at a site designated for only 40 homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3202</th>
<th>Respondent: 17400641 / Stuart Adair Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh. I object to this because: it does not consider the previous objection reasons; there is no evidence of demand travelling people plots in this location; this is Green Belt land hence land use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should not be changed; this is a significant number of houses that have a major impact on nature of area to wildlife, life in the village, the balance of the population geographically, traffic, and views in a very negative way; this development in an area with flood zone 2 and the total inadequate planning concerning flooding any devolpment would cause problems here and up and down stream if here as planning does hot consider the whole basin nor the all contributing factors.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I object to the change in designation of these sites to "Travellers" plots and industrial floorspace. The need for increased Traveller plot numbers is not proven nor is the position and location of the site suitable. This is adjacent to an already very busy, traffic-accident and traffic congestion-prone road and and circa 400 new homes/plots and the associated car/caravan numbers entering and exiting the site will exacerbate this further. As per my objection on A42, this too will place a great strain on an already very residentially dense area of the borough and exacerbate the underprovision of local amenities and infrastructure. This coupled with the new industrial floorspace and increase numbers of lorries and industrial related vehicle traffic, plus the proposed junction onto the A3 at Burntcommon, risks increased further congestion to an already trafficjam heavy blackspot for the A3 interchange with M25 at Ripley. This has repercussions to increase car numbers and Gridlock through Ripley village which is damaging to the qualities that make the Village a desirable place to live, plus the increased pollution and damage to air quality.

Existing local schools, doctors surgeries and shops will not be able to cope with this added influx of residents. [Response has been redacted due to statements being considered defamatory, derogatory, inflammatory or offensive in nature] considering the encroachment of the Greenbelt already planned for this area of Send and Ripley, and risks placing the existing natural ecosystem and habitats of wild birds and animals, not to mention the historic importance of these ancient woodlands at Garlicks Arch, at great risk of damage and extinction.

In summary, these proposals are unsuitable and the needs not proven considering the other available sites (including available brownfield sites) where these particular plots and industrial provision would be much better suited - why place a new industrial park so far away from the existing one at Slyfield when there is space closer to Slyfield site to develop instead - this seems a huge oversight and makes little sense from a perspective of logistics and efficiency for the operation of the industrial processes at these two sites. The increase in Traveller plot numbers and their proposed position in Send and Ripley really places existing infrastructure and amenities at great strain and risks damaging the demographic balance and quality of the built and natural environment which make this area of Guildford, and indeed Surrey, a desirable place to live for not only existing residents, but for those looking to move to the Borough.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
I simply don't understand how the protection of green belt in this manner can be allowed. What possible exceptional circumstances can be shown to make this acceptable. The inclusion now of pitches for "travelling show people" despite the thousands of objections you have received as by suggesting there is a need for travelling show people pitches is cynical use of a minority, by suggesting such a need even exists. You should be ashamed at your blatant attempt to bypass the protection of a lovely area to get your way and build some 400 homes to meet some central government quota which takes NO consideration of impact. This is unacceptable and should not proceed.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3366  Respondent:  17408225 / Jill and Arthur Thomas  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because I am not convinced there is a need for any Travelling Showpeople plots in this area. The number of new houses planned is EXCESSIVE and it is IN THE GREEN BELT. Again, it will cause more traffic problems in the area than there are already.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3381  Respondent:  17408321 / Graham Legge  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Land at Garlik’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3384  Respondent:  17408385 / Jon Cooling  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3419</th>
<th>Respondent: 17412193 / Beryl Evans</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch. There have already been thousands of previous objections made by local people opposed to this plan. To date there has been no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location so why should we cater for this? This is a stunning Green Belt area that we should protect and not build upon. This area is subject to frequent flooding and should not be built upon. Considering the amount of waster that travellers left in Bromley recently, as highlighted in Sunday newspapers, there are obvious concerns over the impacts on the local area and the costs to local people.

The increase in residential houses will put a strain on the Village Medical Centre and the school, which are already over subscribed. With reported cuts in school budgets, how are such services expected to maintain quality.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3444</th>
<th>Respondent: 17413025 / Sally Novell</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)

I object to Garlicks Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of six Travelling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlicks Arch

The allocation of six Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlicks Arch

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlicks Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of the village and the number of homes is excessive
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of the Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley and the A3 which is already subject to severe congestion

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3473  **Respondent:** 17414241 / Lavinia Green  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to changes relating to policy A43 Garlick’s Arch because:

- Again you have ignored the thousands of previous objections.
- There are no “exceptional circumstances” required to develop on this Green belt.
- It will generate excessive traffic along the Clandon Road with associated noise and light pollution. This will be made even worse if the adjoining Policy A58 is implemented.
- It would appear that there is no demand for Travelling Showpeople plots.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3486  **Respondent:** 17414561 / Elliot Rowland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
I object to policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch for the following reasons:

Again this change totally disregards the thousands of previous objections. It is a beautiful area of Green Belt with very valuable and beautiful ancient woodland – something which is totally irreplaceable. It is a massive development for a village of this size causing Ripley and Send to join up, something which Green Belt land is designed to prevent. Again – another development in this area will massively increase the congestion on surrounding roads, something which is already a particular problem in our area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

There are no “exceptional circumstances” for development in this Green Belt area.

There is no proven demand in this location for Travelling Showpeople plots.

This area floods very often and is a designated floodzone.

The number of homes is excessive, will cause over-development in Send village and generate extra traffic that will considerably overload existing local and main roads in both Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots
I object to Policy A 43 because it will cause over-development of Send and the number of homes is excessive. It will join us to Ripley which will defeat the key purpose of the green belt. It is a beautiful permanent Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist. It is subject to frequent flooding plots in this location. It ignores the thousands of previous objections made by local people. There will be pressure on village services and the excessive traffic that will cause heavy congestion on the A247 and the surrounding roads of Send and Ripley. There is no proven demand for plots for Travelling Show people.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3553  Respondent: 17416801 / Angharad Good  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3576  Respondent: 17417217 / Paul Good  Agent: 

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.

It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years.

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3594</th>
<th>Respondent: 17418401 / Charles Penny</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I object to the extended development within the Green Belt and the addition of 6 Travelling show people sites at Garlick’s Arch (A43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I object to the extension of Garlick’s Arch as it is entirely inappropriate for the Green Belt and will only increase Urban Sprawl. I also object to the proposal of 6 plots for travelling show people and there is no need for these to be built as the allocation in site A50 more than covers the 8 ‘needed’ as mentioned in the plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The further extension of the homes at Garlick’s Arch if the plots aren’t used is completely unsustainable and will put a stretch on the area of Ripley and Send like never before. People move to this area for its idyllic country life style (as mentioned in the plan 2.10a as something to protect) and even now, especially in rush hour there are constant queues of traffic and the roads are just not made for it. In addition to the strain on the roads, the schools and surgeries will also be hugely affected due to the sheer number of people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Filling in Garlick’s Arch further will also close the gap between Ripley/Send and Burnt Common which defeats the object of the Green Belt to keep the area open.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3604</th>
<th>Respondent: 17419297 / Nick Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposed changes to this site which in combination would generate considerable activity in a most unsuitable location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitches designated for Show People suggests large vehicle traffic movements and a further extension to the commercial premises that have already been added on that side of the road all of which is located in close proximity to the surrounding residential area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the number of houses would mean a truly massive increase in the volume of traffic which will only be able to use the A3, Send Road and travelling through Ripley, all of which are unsuitable for the level of traffic associated with such a development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of
the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause log jams of these villages.

**Garlick’s Arch (A43)** should not be extended or even developed with the resulting urban sprawl. There are no
exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

**I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Show people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch**

The allocation of 6 Travelling Show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site
according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Show people plots in A43 Garlicks
Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section
4.2.24 of the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43, which has changed to include 6 Travelling Showpeople plots despite no evidence to demonstrate a demand for these in this area. Furthermore this policy would involve the destruction of Green Belt despite there being no 'exceptional circumstances' for doing so and the fact that this ancient woodland dates back over 400 years and includes trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Additionally the implementation of this policy will put strain on both the local transport networks and infrastructure including schools and medical facilities in Ripley and Send, which are not large enough to deal with this increased pressure.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: PSLPS16/3392  Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to building 400 houses and 7000 sq. metres of industrial space at Garlick’s Arch. Please see below for detailed reasons.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3682  Respondent: 17424705 / Keith Brothwell  Agent:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the policy A43 very strongly.

I wish our village to remain in the Green Belt and I cannot see any 'exceptional circumstances' which might enable the council to consider removing us. Living here and purchasing a home here was because of the Green Belt protection to our wonderful countryside. Ripley and Send/Burnt Common are distinct village areas. This proposal tries to link them up resulting in a semi-urban sprawl which goes against the policy of the Green Belt.

Local villagers have already made strong objections which appear to have been ignored! There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.

The number of houses proposed for our village needs is excessive and will cause huge over development of our area. The road networks are already extremely busy and this proposal will result in a huge increase of traffic. Local roads and junctions with the main A3 simply will not cope with the extra influx. Additional traffic jams will result causing untold delays and inconvenience to people trying to commute to London or deliver children to local schools.

The area is subject to flooding (it is currently a flood zone 2 area) - further development will only make matters worse.

The area in question has been used over many years for shooting and the land is contaminated by lead shot.
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3686  Respondent: 17424737 / Angela Hicks  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Show People plot.

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:

This policy ignores the fact that there is no proven demand for Travelling Show people plots in this location.

It is situated in beautiful permanent; Green Belt and no "exceptional circumstances" exist. The area is ancient woodland in existence since the reign of Elizabeth I.

It will cause over-development of Send village and consequent congestion on the roads and join up Send to Ripley with consequent defeat of the object of the Green Belt.

It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3692  Respondent: 17424801 / Gregory Webb  Agent:
Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

• Policy A43 - Garlick’s Arch

I have previously objected to the proposed development of 400 houses on this Green Belt and good agricultural land. The new policy A43 adds 8 travelling/showpeople pitches to this development rendering the policy even more inappropriate for the area. The Borough Council is reminded that less than 3 years ago it refused a planning application from ‘Oldlands’ to build just 25 houses in the same location. The Council cannot therefore incorporate this policy within the Plan and still maintain that it applies consistent and good practice.

This policy would increase the population of the Send Marsh/Burnt Common village by 49% and totally destroy its rural character.

I therefore strongly object to the revised proposal on the grounds that;

1. the village has no shops or other infrastructure to support the development;
2. the additional traffic generated would create major congestion on the already busy roads throughout the villages of Send, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley;
3. no ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to destroy this Green Belt land or the ancient woodland it contains;
4. there is no proven demand for travelling/showpeople pitches in this location, and
5. it would join up and destroy the distinct character of the villages of Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)
I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

The Plan is self-inconsistent in respect of traveller sites.
A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy, shows on the Site details: “Allocation: The site is allocated for approximately 14 Travelling Showpeople plots ….” Clearly A50 more than covers the total “need” of 8, (page 40, 4.2.22.) and so no “need” exists for this in site A43. This and other inconsistencies in the Plan mean no decision can be made on the basis of this document.

I object to the hiding of development by “deferment” (A24, A25, A26, A43)
This version of the Plan has concealed some development planned to take place by “deferring” it beyond the period covered by the Local Plan. This is designed to have 2 effects:
i) to hide the number of housed actually being built (A24, A25, A26 – total of 1100 deferred, but still being built!) , and
ii) give an excuse for building houses on another site (A43 – 400/650 houses proposed) when they are not needed.

I object to the potential and ill-defined increase in housing allocation at A43 Garlick’s Arch
The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

GBC’s own reasons for including Garlick’s Arch A43 in the 2016 version were

1. The site [A43] location affords greater separation between Send Marsh/Burnt Common and the proposed site allocation at Gosden Hill Farm, … (site allocation A25) [ than the Burnt Common site did ]”
2. The site [A43] provides the employment floorspace needed in the plan to help meet identified needs”

Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) the separation issue is clearly being ignored as BOTH sites (which are almost contiguous) are in the plan; therefore GBC are not following their own guidelines and objectives.
Since A58 Burnt Common is now in the Plan (2017) more than the “required” industrial space is available there, so there is no reason for Garlick’s Arch to be included.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3731  **Respondent:** 17425569 / Jack Cross  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the removal of this site from Green Belt. It was included at the last minute in the 2016 draft, without justification other than the proposed A3 slip roads.

I object to the proposal of travelling showmen as Ripley already has 4 travellers pitches, with more are proposed on site A35.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3751  **Respondent:** 17425889 / Karen Thornton  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the proposed allocation for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt. There are not enough services and infrastructure for housing and show people plots, nor any justification for concentrating 6 of the proposed 8 borough-wide show people plots within Send. The roads in Send are not equipped to deal with the kind of traffic that will be generated by this in Send. It is also subject to flooding and has a flood zone 2 allocation.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3755  **Respondent:** 17426081 / Robert Yates  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I OBJECT to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location.
- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist.
• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive.
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I.
• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation.
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years.
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3761  Respondent: 17426401 / Kate Legge  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• The is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no ‘exception circumstances’ exist
• It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth I
• It will join p Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3767  Respondent: 17426593 / Darren Moss  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to Policy A43 change at Garlick's Arch because:
Sneakily Increased to 400 homes and the addition of 6 travelling show people pitches
This proposed development totally ignored the previous 1000s of strong objections from local residents.
There is currently no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area.
It is green belt and has been existence for many hundreds of years and no exceptional circumstances exist for this development to be built.
The idea of green belt is to separate villages, if this is built it will effectively joint Ripley and Send together.
It is currently a flood zone and liable to frequent flooding and I understand is contaminated with lead shot accumulated over many years.

The sheer number of properties will have major impact to the roads and infrastructure which are already struggling from existing traffic issues.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3772  **Respondent:** 17426657 / Craig Church  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

I write with reference to the local plan and in particular the changes to the site A43 Land at Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh Burnt Common and Ripley. In section 4.2 Housing Policies, Policy H1 section 7 states:

(7) Accommodation for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople (whether they meet the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites definition or not) accommodation should be provided on development sites of 500 homes or more whilst there remains an identified need. For 500 to 999 homes two pitches or plots should be provided, for 1,000 to 1,499 homes four pitches or plots, for 1,500 to 1,999 homes six pitches or plots and for 2,000 or more homes eight pitches or plots.

The land at Garlick's Arch is proposed to have 400 new homes built on it making it too small a development to include accommodation for travelling show people.

The impact of the 400 new homes (excessive for the size of the site and surrounding area) in the small village of Send and the impact on the traffic on the Portsmouth road can only be made even worse with the addition of the large vehicles, that usually travel in convoy, that are associated with travelling show people.

The future of the area and indeed the whole country is going through a period of extreme change and uncertainty following the country's decision to leave the European union. Foreign investors who bought property and left it standing empty purely because it would increase in percentage value better than any bank interest rate have stopped buying property. There has also been a slowdown in migration into Britain from EU countries. This will reduce the strain on the housing market and hopefully the government will put steps in place to get some of the hundreds of thousands of empty properties in the country available to rent or buy. I strongly believe we should protect our green belt land and keep our villages within it. There are may steps that can be taken to improve the housing situation without concreting over the south east of England.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/3798  **Respondent:** 17427713 / The Aldertons Farm Residents Company Limited  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

The proposal for 400 residential units and 6 travelling showpeoples plots on a Green Belt site is contrary to current policies and ignores the many thousands of objections previously made by local people.
No ‘Special Circumstances’ exist or have been put forward to justify development on this Green Belt site.

The development will put extreme pressure on local roads and when considered with the other nearby proposals for development currently being put forward by the Council in the Draft Local Plan, (both residential and commercial/industrial), will result in gridlock at peak times with the resultant detriment to the quality of life and environment in the area, particularly considering the impact that the proposed North and South slip roads on to the A3 would make by drawing more traffic on to the local road network.

Residential development alongside major highways is known to cause health problems in the very young and old and if this site is developed the long term impact on the residents will in turn put more pressure on local and County Health facilities, particularly if the A3 slip roads abutting one side of the site, (as previously mentioned) are constructed thus increasing traffic flow around the site. The A3 is a major Trunk road that will inevitably become overloaded in the not too distant future given the lack of infrastructure improvements proposed by the Council to cope with the influx of traffic with regard to both proposed imminent and long term development.

The site contains ancient woodlands and should be protected (and enhanced) against development that might impinge upon the quality of the surrounding area and adversely affect the survival of the trees which are regarded as an important amenity for the area and can be seen from distant views.

Garlicks Arch adds to the important Green Barrier that separates the villages of Ripley and Send Marsh and any erosion of this will set precedent and eventually result in the merging of the two villages contrary to National Green Belt policy.

The site is currently designated as within Flood Zone 2/3 and as such development within Flood Plains should be avoided. If development is inevitable then Surface Water mitigation/management must ensure that flood water is properly dealt with and NOT directed so as to cause flooding elsewhere on existing developed land.

There is no proven demand to accommodate Travelling Showpeople in this area who, by the very nature of their business, will bring more traffic problems for the Ripley and Send villages when transporting very large vehicles to and from the site, where the visual impact of the vehicles and structures when stored, will be detrimental to the surrounding area.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

Comment ID: pslp172/3825  Respondent: 17432673 / M Clark  Agent:

Document:  Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location

It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist

It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive

It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1

It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt

It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years

It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/3889  Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to the extended development in the Green Belt (Policy P2, Site A43)**

I object to Garlick’s Arch (A43) being extended and the resulting urban sprawl. There are **no exceptional circumstances** for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/3890  Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Showpeople sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch**

The allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be **no** inclusion of any Travelling Showpeople plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

---

### Comment ID: pslp172/3898  Respondent: 17434049 / Lucy Starke  Agent:
**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. **I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)**

The Foreword to the plan by Paul Spooner includes on page 5:
“We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”.

The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlicks Arch and A42 Clock Barn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3937  Respondent: 17434689 / Anya Williamson  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Policy A43 change for the following reasons:

- No ‘exceptional circumstances’ exist to justify this use of Green Belt land
- It ignores the thousands of previous objections already made by local residents
- The site is ancient woodland from the time of Queen Elizabeth 1 and cannot be replaced
- The development would effectively join up the villages of Send and Ripley and defeating the very purpose of Green Belt land
- It is currently a Zone 2 Flood area and development will make matters considerably worse
- It will generate massive amounts of additional traffic that the local road network simply cannot cope with

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3941  Respondent: 17434785 / Steve Nicoll  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots

I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:

• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location
• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist
- It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive
- It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
- It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
- It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
- It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years
- It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

**What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?**

**Attached documents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3945</th>
<th>Respondent: 17434817 / Jenny Wicks</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to this policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is stated to be for approximately 400 homes, but the removal of 7,000 sq metres of industrial floorspace proposed for this site in the previous draft plan means that the eventual number of houses is likely to be considerably greater. This in an area remote from services and without credible access to public transport. It will create a car dependent community, increasing the stress on the nearby A3. No infrastructure provision for this site is included in the infrastructure delivery plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Common is already a site of considerable traffic congestion which will be exacerbated by the proposed slip roads on (northbound) and off (southbound) the A3 are built, feeding traffic onto the A247 through West Clandon and through Send Village, both unsuitable for increased traffic flows.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attached documents:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3965</th>
<th>Respondent: 17440225 / Louisa Scott</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document:</strong> Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you consider this section of the document: complies with the Duty to Cooperate?</strong> ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlicks Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no exception circumstances exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It will cause overdevelopment of our village and the number of homes is excessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1
• It will join Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt
• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation
• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over 50 years
• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3972  Respondent: 17440385 / Rob Barnes  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Policy A43 Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh

I object to the proposed allocation for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people plots. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant development on the green belt. There is insufficient services infrastructure for housing and show people plots, nor any justification for concentrating 6 of the proposed 8 borough-wide show people plots within Send. The road network is insufficient for housing development on this scale.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/3978  Respondent: 17440705 / Chris Brown  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

I object to the Garlick’s Arch (A43) proposed changes to this site which in combination would generate considerable activity in a most unsuitable location.

Pitches designated for Show People suggests large vehicle traffic movements and a further extension to the commercial premises that have already been added on that side of the road all of which is located in close proximity to the surrounding residential area.

Increasing the number of houses would mean a truly massive increase in the volume of traffic which will only be able to use the A3, Send Road and travelling through Ripley, all of which are unsuitable for the level of traffic associated with such a development.

The potential of an increase from 400 houses at site A43 Garlick’s Arch will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause log jams of these villages.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) should not be extended or even developed with the resulting urban sprawl. There are no exceptional circumstances for this site being removed from the Green Belt, as required by the National Planning Policy.

I object to the allocation of 6 Traveling Show people sites in A34 Garlick’s Arch
The allocation of 6 Travelling Show people plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. There should be no inclusion of any Travelling Show people plots in A43 Garlicks Arch as this development site is for 400 homes and so is not compliant with the minimum of 500 in as stated in section 4.2.24 of the Plan.

The inclusion of site A58 Burt Common, removes the need for A43 Garlick’s Arch

I further object to the Garlicks Arch site because if A58 Burt Common site and development at Gosden Hill Farm is also granted then the A3 corridor from Burpham to Ripley will be over developed and it will simply join up a sprawling set of developments. These in turn will lead to greater traffic density, slower journey times as well as increasing safety concerns for an infrastructure which cannot support this level of traffic.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/3983</th>
<th>Respondent: 17440705 / Chris Brown</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (A43 and A42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan lacks any infrastructure proposals to support all the development. There are no proposed plans to upgrade roads or introduce new roads or links, and it is simply a plan of building additional housing and commercial facilities but expecting the current road system to support more traffic which it is incapable of doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached documents:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4070</th>
<th>Respondent: 17447329 / Justin Rowland</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh, Policy A43. Now 400 homes and 6 Travelling Showpeople plots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I object to the Policy A43 change at Garlick’s Arch because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no proven demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is beautiful permanent Green Belt and no “exceptional circumstances” exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will cause over-development of our village and the number of homes is excessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is exquisite ancient woodland that existed at the time of Elizabeth 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will join up Ripley and Send and defeat the key purpose of Green Belt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is subject to frequent flooding and is currently a flood zone 2 allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is contaminated by lead shot accumulated over fifty years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will generate excessive traffic that will block up the local roads of Send and Ripley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

Again, this merely ignores previous objections. The proposed changes make no attempt to take any account of valid objections made to the original Plan.

There is absolutely no evidence of any demand for Travelling Showpeople plots in this area.

It is currently permanent Green Belt land and no "exceptional circumstances" exist to justify its development, as required by legislation. This is woodland that has existed since the time of Elizabeth 1 and the proposed scale of development is excessive; too many homes are proposed - these proposals would merely lead to over-development which current infrastructure is incapable of catering for.

The proposals would effectively join up Ripley and Send. One of the original principles of Green Belt legislation was to prevent such sprawl.

The area is currently adversely affected by flooding and is a flood zone 2 allocation. The current proposals will exacerbate this.

The area is affected by lead shot which has reached serious levels, having accumulated over the last 50 years.

The proposed development will cause serious traffic congestion; current roads are inadequate to handle the level of vehicular movement which will inevitably be generated and local roads in Send and Ripley will be blocked up as a result.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

I object to Policy A43 this land is Green Belt, with ancient woodland. The development would have a huge impact on the Flora, fauna and wildlife in the vicinity and development on this land will join the villages of Ripley and Send together defeating the object of the Green Belt. The local roads, doctors, schools, amenities are already struggling to cope with the existing residents and would be under pressure and would definitely not be fit to serve residents from another 400 homes.

Finally I feel that consideration should be made to firstly the existing infrastructure especially A247 Send Road, Clandon Road and Portsmouth Road at Ripley, the bus service, doctors, schools, shops etc. should any development within Send be approved.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the Garlick’s Arch proposal as it uses valuable green belt land and the green space between the settlements at Burnt Common, Send Marsh and Ripley resulting in unacceptable harm to the openness of the Green Bely and the vistas locally and from the Surrey Hills AONB.

2. I continue to object to the inclusion of the following policies:

3. A36-A41 inclusive in the Horsleys, A43 at Garlick’s Arch, A42 Clockbarn, and A58. There is no evidence that anyone has considered the cumulative impact of these developments together with the development at A35. The infrastructure proposed is totally inadequate and, as these stand at the borough boundary will have a huge impact on residents throughout the borough and further afield, particularly those who use the A3.

4. I object to the fact that the land required at Garlick’s Arch is said to be almost 29ha where only 13ha is required at 30dph.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4168  Respondent: 17459617 / Renaissance Classics (Keith Sohl)  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43 

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

...our company which is based on the Portsmouth Road in Ripley and is directly opposite to the proposed development at Garlick’s Arch. As a long time resident within the Woking and Guildford areas I have noted the ongoing deterioration in traffic congestion in this part of Surrey. Expanding residential properties to the extent proposed at Garlick’s arch without planned infrastructure improvements will cause further congestion problems which are very detrimental to the local community in so many respects notably the environment coupled with social and economic factors. Your plan has not shown how infrastructure improvements in all respects (not just road network) would be made. A vague recognition that infrastructure improvements will be required is not specific enough and if such developments are to take place without causing multiple problems then far more consideration has to be given to the strains that such levels of local population explosion will create. I hope that the concerns of local businesses will be listened to as they are the people that need to create employment and economic growth opportunities at a local level. Increasing population and density without the correct infrastructure will be harmful.

As a local business which will be very directly affected by the new proposals in the Guildford Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan (June 2017), we object very strongly to these and in particular to the changes affecting Ripley and Send, which make the Plan even worse than the 2016 proposals. We object on the following grounds :-

- Any development at Site A43 Garlick’s Arch would be on Green Belt land, and there is no identified or exceptional need within the Local Plan documentation for this to be the case. The potential of an increase from 400 houses at this site will be extremely harmful to the rural nature of the surrounding villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon and will cause coalescence of these villages.

- The inclusion of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots with associated storage facilities at Site A43 Garlick’s Arch is entirely inappropriate in a rural environment within the Green Belt and there is no identified need within the Local Plan.

In that respect, the allocation of 6 Travelling Showpeople plots is the designated formula for 1500-1999 homes on the same site according to the 2017 Local Plan. However, the Plan is self-inconsistent and therefore not properly constituted. Section 4.2.22 of the Plan states that “Sufficient sites are identified within the Local Plan [for] 8 plots for Travelling Showpeople” Why are 75% of them planned for Ripley? This is unbalanced and unfair and we contend...
that no Traveller sites should be part of any housing development plan for this area as there is provision at other locations that more than covers the need (e.g. Site A50 Whittles Drive, Normandy).

Also, the Plan states that “if the [Traveller sites] remain unsold, the future use of the land should have regard to an up to date Traveller Accommodation Assessment (TAA) and Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), with specific consideration of the use of the land for affordable housing”. We re-iterate that we consider that the provision of even more Travellers’ pitches and houses is unjustified in this rural environment.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pslp172/5221</td>
<td>Renaissance Classics (Keith Sohl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of proper infrastructure for planning for Sites A43 and A42: the Foreword to the Plan by Paul Spooner states on page 5: “We recognise that significant infrastructure upgrades are required to support existing communities and the planned growth of the borough. The delivery of sites allocated in this plan is contingent upon the provision of new infrastructure, which is a key theme of our Local Plan”. The lack of any plan for either physical or green infrastructure improvement clearly contradicts this in respect of both A43 Garlick’s Arch and A42 Clockbarn Nursery, Tannery Lane, Send. Development of these sites without the contingent infrastructure would therefore be contrary to the stated aims and themes of the Plan, and should not go ahead.

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pslp172/4849</td>
<td>Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Sir or Madam)</td>
<td>Savills (Richard Hill)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Water Response</th>
<th>Waste Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51757</td>
<td>A43 - Land At Garlick's Arch, Send Marsh/ Burnt Common and Ripley</td>
<td>This site falls outside of Thames Water’s water supply boundary.</td>
<td>The wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Strategic drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a wastewater network capacity constraint the developer should liaise with Thames Water and provide a detailed drainage strategy with the planning application, informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists pass through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches 
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people 
3. There is no proven demand for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints, 
4. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required. 
5. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it. 
6. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy. 
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsustainable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided. 
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result. 
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached. 
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site. 
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises. 
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600. 
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlik's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section page number</th>
<th>Document page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1498</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )**

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming even more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II). Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches.
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
4. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of flood flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4495  Respondent: 17491489 / Margaret Perkins  Agent:
Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are ever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/4549  Respondent: 17492897 / James Robinson  Agent:

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to rely on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Godsen Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity! (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the road becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

---

**Comment ID:** pslp172/4648  **Respondent:** 17494945 / Diana Mulholland  **Agent:**

**Document:** Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

**Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate?** ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to rely on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular pastime, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.

3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.

4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy II). Policy II requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy 11). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people.
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location.
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.
12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.
13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.
15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.
16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.
17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:
C.ii. Policy A43 Garlick’s Arch – My Objections

I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches

It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people

There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location

There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.

The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.

This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.

The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.

Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport.

Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick’s Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.

The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.

I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.

I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.
I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.

I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed
for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: pslp172/4779</th>
<th>Respondent: 17497345 / J.E. Pullen</th>
<th>Agent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document:</td>
<td>Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick's Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be
re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss
of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two
businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their
premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will
have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs
centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road
infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for
example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon.
The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan
does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send
are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition.
I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads
and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

15. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from
parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking
problems.

16. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley,
the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time,
particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no
proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being
generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents
involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

17. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development
will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

18. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of
improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the
infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have
been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development,
the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to
capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no
development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the
Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are
already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will
place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no
certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion
during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have
considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35),
Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk
road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to
improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also
mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The
significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to
considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be
particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will
have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)

What changes (2016)/further amendments (2017) do you suggest should be made to the document?

Attached documents:

Comment ID: pslp172/5070  Respondent: 17507713 / T. A Trusler  Agent: 

Document: Proposed Submission Local Plan: strategy and sites 2017 / Policy A43

Do you consider this section of the document; complies with the Duty to Cooperate? ( ), is Sound? ( ), is Legally Compliant? ( )

1. I object to the changed policy A43 Garlick’s Arch for 400 homes and 6 travelling show people pitches
2. It ignores all the thousands of previous objections made by local people
3. There is no proven demand for travelling show people plots in this location
4. There is no need for putting houses on this site because the local plan housing target is incorrect and inflated and ignores constraints.
5. The allocation of 28.9 ha is an excessive land grab into the Green Belt. If we take a normal density of 30 homes per ha and it is at the end of the day proven that there is a need for 400 homes in this location the land requirement is 13 ha not 28.9 ha which is more than double. This replicates a similar over land grab at Burnt Common where the factor is 7 times the land required.
6. This confirms the worrying impression that GBC have a pre-determined policy of building on the Green Belt at every opportunity. The arithmetic does not stack up. One would have thought that they would as custodians of the green Belt be intent on conserving it rather than exploiting it.
7. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, as stated by National Planning Policy.
8. Garlick’s Arch (A43) is in an unsustainable location. It does not benefit from railway stations within easy walking distance and bus services across rural villages are forever reducing. Residents will have few options, but to be reliant on motor vehicles. The site is unsuitable due to lack of access to sustainable transport. Furthermore, there are no plans to improve the infrastructure for Garlick's Arch in the Infrastructure Plan. Residents will be dependent on the car for transport. Greater consideration should be given to increasing the density of development in urban areas, such as Guildford, where more practical sustainable transport options can be provided.
9. The A3, M25 and the roads through the villages of Ripley, Send and Clandon already suffer from congestion. Further vehicle movements will result in even more acute congestion and greater pollution. Residents and the environment will suffer as a result.
10. I object to the proposal to remove Garlick’s Arch from the Green Belt. National Planning Policy requires there to be an exceptional circumstance for the Green Belt boundaries to be altered, or the development on Green Belt. There are no exceptional circumstances for this land to be taken from the Green Belt. Once taken the green belt is lost forever. There is a real danger that the loss of this Green Belt will result in urban sprawl and the neighbouring villages merging into one another. The significant development in West Clandon, Send and Ripley will result in the character of these villages being lost and the countryside encroached.
11. I object to the development at Garlick’s Arch because of flood risk. The site at Garlick’s Arch is identified on the Environment Agency’s flood map as being in a flood Zone 3 from a river. This means that it has a 1 in 100 or greater chance of flooding each year, the highest risk category. Despite this flood risk, the site has been assessed as part of the Council’s SFRA as a Flood Zone 2 - having between a 1% and 0.1% annual probability of river flooding. Knowing the area well I am aware that this site often floods during the winter months and the
flooding is made worse by the soil being heavy clay. Clearly the SFRA is not fit for purpose and it needs to be re-commissioned to accurately reflect the actual flooding risks of each site.

12. I object to the loss of rural employment on the site. The development at Garlick’s Arch would result in the loss of four existing successful rural businesses, which have been in existence for over 30 years and another two businesses for over 9 years. These businesses employ dozens of people; none of them want to leave their premises.

13. I object to the potential loss of Ancient Woodland on the site. The proposed development at Garlick’s Arch will have a permanent impact on the character of the Ancient Woodland that surrounds the site on two sides and runs centrally through the site, which includes over 80 ancient oak trees that existed in the year 1600.

14. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the local village roads and the lack of road infrastructure (Policy I1). Our villages are already suffering from severe congestion for much of the day, for example the Newark Road and Rose Lane junction in the centre of Ripley and the A247 through West Clandon. The proposed development under the plan will cause greater congestion in and around our villages. The Plan does not provide an achievable strategy for improving capacity on these local roads.

15. Furthermore, many of the country lanes around the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Ripley, and Send are narrow and wide enough for only one vehicle at a time. In addition, the road surfaces are in a poor condition. I object to the development proposed in the local plan, which will result in more traffic using these narrow roads and a further deterioration in the road surfaces.

16. Many of the affected villages, such as West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, already suffer from parking problems. Further development around these villages will only result in more traffic and more parking problems.

17. With some 5000 houses being proposed close to the villages of West Clandon, East Clandon, Send and Ripley, the roads serving the village will become even more congested. Cycling has become a popular past time, particularly at weekends hundreds of cyclists past through the village on the way to the Surrey Hills. With no proper cycle lanes on the narrow local roads surrounding the village and with greater vehicle traffic being generated from these developments there is a real danger that there will be an increase in road accidents involving cyclists as a result of the development proposed under the local plan.

18. The narrow rural roads do not have proper pedestrian footpaths. The proposed significant levels of development will result in the roads becoming ever more dangerous for pedestrians.

19. I object to the lack of proper infrastructure planning for sites (Policy I1). Policy I1 requires the delivery of improvements to infrastructure in conjunction with development. I have grave concerns over the planning of the infrastructure requirements and that the projects identified will be implemented when required, if at all.

20. Despite the Garlick’s Arch site (A43) being a significant site for development, no infrastructure projects have been identified in the Infrastructure Schedule. Without improvements to the infrastructure prior to development, the existing residents’ in the locality will see their quality of life significantly deteriorate in many ways.

21. Many of the utilities in the West Clandon, East Clandon, Burpham, Ripley and Send area are at, or very close to capacity, such as the electrical network and sewers. No plans to improve these services should mean no development of the Garlick’s Arch site.

22. Without proper planning and a commitment to fund new healthcare facilities, existing services such as the Villages Medical Centre, Send will have their services stretched and overwhelmed. Many of these services are already at capacity and suffering from funding cuts or freezes. Any further development without funding will place further stress upon existing health services.

23. I object due to the congestion that development will cause to the trunk roads, A3/M25 (Policy I2). There is no certainty that either the A3 or M25 in the borough will be improved to increase capacity and reduce congestion during the Plan period. Highways England has no plans to even examine improving the A3 before 2020. I have considerable concerns that development of the large residential sites identified at Wisley Airfield (A35), Garlick’s Arch (A43) and Gosden Hill (A25), will take place before any improvements are made to the trunk road network. The A3 & M25 are already at capacity during peak hours and any development prior to improvement of these roads will only make the situations worse.

24. I object to poor air quality concerns (Policy I3). Paragraph 4.6.27 of the Plan states that “Development must also mitigate its traffic impacts, including its environmental impacts and impacts on amenity and health.” The significant level of development being proposed, particularly in the north east of the borough will lead to considerable further congestion, despite any attempts to mitigate this through travel plans. This will be particularly acute in built up residential areas and will only lead to greater levels of air pollution, which will have a detrimental effect on local residents and their health.
25. I object to the inclusion of the land at Garlick’s Arch, Send Marsh/Burnt Common and Ripley (A43). Garlick’s Arch has previously been protected from development as Green Belt. Under the Plan it is proposed that the site will be developed for approximately 400 homes (C3) and up to 7,000 sq m of either or a mix of light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). There are no exceptional circumstances which allow for the removal of this land from the Green Belt (Policy P2).

26. It is clear that with this site being added at the eleventh hour and no infrastructure planning has been undertaken. The Infrastructure Schedule makes no provision for any infrastructure improvements for this site. How will the local services such as schools and doctors cope, many of which are already at capacity? (Policy I1)
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